

# **4<sup>th</sup> International Symposium on Politeness**

## **“East Meets West”**

### **Book of Abstracts**



**Budapest**  
**July 2-4, 2008**



## List of Presenters (in alphabetic order)

### Keynote Speakers

|                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| MILLS, SARA.....        | 3   |
| PAN, YULING.....        | 5-6 |
| PIZZICONI, BARBARA..... | 7   |

### Presenters

|   |    |
|---|----|
| ADAMS, RACHEL.....  | 9  |
| AGIS, DERYA.....  | 10 |
| BAX, MARCEL & STREEKSTRA, NANNIE.....                                   | 11 |
| BREHMER, BERNHARD & FISCHER, KATRIN BENTE.....                          | 12 |
| CAMPANA, MARK & ERICKSON, DONNA & CAMPBELL, NICK & TAKAAKI, SHOCHI..... | 13 |
| CHAEMSAITHONG, KRISDA.....  | 14 |
| CULPEPER, JONATHAN & SCHAUER, GILA & MARTI, LEYLA & MEI, MEILIAN.....   | 15 |
| DEWAARD DYKSTRA, LISA.....  | 16 |
| DIDI-OGREN, HOLLY.....  | 17 |
| FITZMAURICE, SUSAN M. ....  | 18 |
| GEYER, NAOMI.....   | 19 |
| GRAINGER, KAREN & MILLS, SARA & SIBANDA, MANDLA.....                    | 19 |
| HATİPOĞLU, CILER.....   | 20 |
| HAUGH, MICHAEL.....   | 21 |
| HE, YUN.....  | 22 |
| HELD, GUDRUN.....   | 23 |
| HEWITT, HEATHER.....  | 24 |
| HONG, JIN-OK.....   | 25 |
| HSIEH, SHIN-CHIEH.....  | 26 |
| HUDSON, MUTSUKO ENDO.....   | 27 |
| INAGAKI, NORIKO.....  | 28 |
| JAKUBOWSKA, EWA.....  | 29 |
| JUCKER, ANDREAS H. ....   | 30 |
| KÁDÁR, DÁNIEL Z. ....   | 31 |
| KAMPF, ZOHAR.....   | 32 |
| KAUR, BALJIT.....   | 32 |
| KIM, ALAN HYUN-OAK.....   | 33 |
| KING, JEREMY.....   | 34 |
| KRANJC, SIMONA & NIDORFER ŠIŠKOVIČ, MOJCA.....                          | 35 |
| KRYLOVÁ, BARBORA.....   | 36 |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| LEE, CHER LENG.....  | 37 |
| LÓPEZ SAKO, NOBUO IGNACIO.....                                       | 38 |
| MAIZ-AREVALO, CARMEN & FREIRE FARIA, RITA.....                       | 39 |
| MARQUEZ REITER, ROSINA.....  | 40 |
| MASUKO, MAYUMI.....  | 41 |
| MIYAKE, KAZUKO.....  | 42 |
| NEVALA, MINNA.....   | 43 |
| NISHIMURA, YUKIKO.....   | 44 |
| O'DRISCOLL, JIM.....   | 45 |
| OBARA, HIROSHI.....  | 45 |
| OGIERMANN, EVA & SUSZCZYŃSKA, MAŁGORZATA.....                        | 46 |
| PARAMASIVAM, SHAMALA.....  | 47 |
| PATERNOSTER, ANNICK.....   | 48 |
| RUHI, ŞÜKRIYE.....   | 49 |
| RUSIESHVILI, MANANA.....   | 50 |
| SALLO, IBRAHIM.....  | 51 |
| SÁROSI, ZSÓFIA.....  | 51 |
| SATO, YOICHI.....  | 52 |
| SILVEIRA, SONIA BITTENCOURT & OLIVEIRA, MARIA DO CARMO LEITE DE..... | 53 |
| STADLER, STEFANIE & SPENCER-OATEY, HELEN.....                        | 54 |
| SULEIMAN, ROZINA & SAZALIE, AZIMAH & HASSAN, HASMIDAR.....           | 55 |
| TANAKA, HIROMASA.....  | 56 |
| TANAKA, HIROMASA & ZHANG, XIAO RUI.....                              | 57 |
| TANNER, JOHANNA.....   | 58 |
| TERKOURAFI, MARINA.....  | 58 |
| TOSHIYUKI, SADANOBU.....   | 59 |
| TOURNIER, HADRIEN.....   | 59 |
| UM, JEONGMI.....   | 60 |
| VICENTE, HELENA & RAMALHO, FABÍULA.....                              | 60 |
| VICTORIA, MABELLE.....   | 61 |
| WATANABE, YASUHISA.....  | 61 |
| WOODMAN, KAREN.....  | 62 |
| XIANG, CATHERINE HUA.....  | 62 |
| ZHANG, XIAOMING.....   | 63 |

**Politeness and Culture**

MILLS, SARA

Sheffield Hallam University; E-Mail: [S.L.Mills@shu.ac.uk](mailto:S.L.Mills@shu.ac.uk)

Very often when discussing the manifestations of politeness in various cultures, the views of cultures are very homogenising. It is assumed that all of the speakers of a particular language, who are elided with all members of that culture, use the same forms of politeness and have the same positive views about politeness (Japanese and English are seen as negative politeness cultures and America, Greece and Australia are seen as positive politeness cultures). This ignores the contested nature of politeness norms within cultures and languages. Working class and middle class communities within Britain do not necessarily have the same 'take' on politeness and evaluation of for example negative politeness. The notion of bad manners or impoliteness is often associated with a class and educational dimension (see for example, the use of honorifics in Japanese). Women are stereotypically associated with certain styles of politeness (whether they are in fact more polite than men is highly debatable). However, if certain sections of the population because of class and gender have different views of politeness and have different style of politeness available to them, we need to question the generalisations that we make about cultures having particular styles of politeness and be explicit about whose politeness norms we are describing. This paper sets out to investigate how we can describe general patterns in politeness use within particular languages as a resource which will be differently evaluated by particular groups within that culture, without assuming that the culture as a whole is homogeneous.



**Looking Beyond the Form of Linguistic Presentation:  
Approach to Politeness across Cultures**

PAN, YULING

United States Census Bureau; E-Mail: [yuling.pan@census.gov](mailto:yuling.pan@census.gov)

Brown and Levinson's influential work on politeness (1978, 1987) has generated much interest among researchers to study politeness as an area in pragmatics. In the last three decades since the publication of Brown and Levinson's work, almost every aspect of Brown and Levinson's politeness model has been examined, applied, contested, challenged, or modified (e.g., Eelen 2001, Mills 2003). The theoretical inquiries on politeness have resulted in huge amount of empirical research and have shed light on the concepts of politeness and face within and across language and cultural boundaries. In spite of the rich investigation on the theoretical aspects of politeness, methodological issues in politeness research have been left behind, particularly, research on methodologies to study politeness across cultures. As many researchers rightly point out, the Brown and Levinson's politeness model is based on the Anglo-Saxon tradition. The starting point, as well as the focus, of this Anglo-Saxon tradition is the individual or the Model Speaker in a Brown and Levinsonian sense. This focal point has anchored the politeness research to concentrate on the linguistic presentation of politeness, such as indirectness, speech acts, and conventional polite expressions.

When approaching politeness in different languages with this methodology, researchers are faced with the challenges that many linguistic features of politeness are either language-specific or situation-specific. It is difficult to draw convincing comparisons across cultures on the dimension of politeness. For example, debates over Eastern and Western cultures on politeness behavior include the distinction of discernment politeness for Asian cultures and volitional politeness for Western cultures (e.g., Mastumoto 1988, 1989, Ide et al. 1992, Gu 1990, Mao 1992, 1994). This distinction was challenged through several arguments. One of the arguments is that the required polite behavior appropriate to the social interaction is not specific to Asian societies and that the dichotomous distinction between discernment and volitional politeness should be seen as a spectrum of possibilities (e.g., Watts 2003).

In this paper, I argue that theoretical debates over politeness should be better informed by sound research methodologies and that politeness theories have to be tempered by the idea that politeness is always situational. No absolutes are possible. So any analysis we do has to take the specific situation into account and to be comparative across situations. In order to do so, we need to develop an analytical and methodological framework that accounts for cultural assumptions for human relationships and social requirements for interaction in a situation, as well as social variables called for in politeness theories. I call this a situation-oriented approach to study politeness across cultures.

A situation-oriented approach views politeness as linguistic strategies and discourse resources available to participants to employ in order to achieve certain interactional goals in an interaction. Participants utilize these strategies and resources according to the situation, participant's role, and goal(s) of the interaction. In order to define politeness, we need, first of all, to define the situation of the interaction as politeness is other-oriented and situational. The fluid nature of politeness makes it subtle and elusive if the situation or the context of interaction is not taken into account in the analysis.

I will further illustrate this point by using findings from two multilingual projects. They are "Professional Communication in International Settings" (PCIS) (Pan, Scollon and Scollon 2002) and "Cross-cultural Communication Norms and Survey Interviews" (CCNSI) (Pan 2007, Pan et al. 2008). PCIS examines professional communication norms, as well as politeness norms, in three cultural settings: Beijing, Hong Kong, and Finland. From this project, we have developed a three-culture reflective model for analyzing professional communication across cultures. That is, we have analyzed not only the participants' behavior, but also the participants' reflection of themselves and perception of others.

CCNSI investigates the linguistic behavior in survey interviews of speakers across five language groups: English, Chinese, Korean, Russian, and Spanish. We have worked out a framework for comparing interviewees' linguistic behaviors, including linguistic politeness, across languages. We have conducted two kinds of analysis: analysis of interview transcripts and analysis of group members' perception of interviews as a communicative event. Similar to PCIS project, this project has built in a method of triangulation. That is, in addition to analyzing interview transcripts, we have conducted debriefing sessions with the interviewers in these language groups in order to obtain their perception of the interviewees' behavior.

Findings from these two projects demonstrate that politeness permeates every stage of interaction in professional or institutional communication. However, at the same time, it is subject to change according to the social requirements and communication norms of the situation. It is also subject to the evaluation and judgment of participants in a given situation. What is considered polite by one language group may be considered impolite by another group. What is deemed appropriate in one situation may be seen as inappropriate in another. The seemingly inconsistency of politeness often leads analysis or comparison to fall into binarism and stereotyping.

These projects suggest that a more systematic way to study politeness across cultures should start with the analysis of the interaction situation. This analysis includes identifying some fundamental and

underlying cultural norms for polite behavior, including expectations for polite behavior in a given situation, followed by the analysis of the power structure, the source of power, and interaction conventions in that situation. One method for this level of analysis is to study participants' perception and reflection of the situation by observing their actual action or behavior and by focus group or debriefing discussions. After this level of analysis is completed, the linguistic analysis of politeness will be plausible and comparable. This approach thus incorporates the methodology of the ethnography of communication with interactional sociolinguistics and discourse analysis.

I will conclude the paper by stating that a situation-oriented approach to politeness is not only a methodological position, but also a theoretical position. The methodological issues will inform theoretical notions. Moving away from the linguistic presentation of politeness will help us better understand linguistic politeness.

## References:

- Brown, P. & Levinson, S.C. (1978) 1987. *Politeness – Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eelen, G. 2001. *A Critique of Politeness Theories*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Ide, Sachiko. 1989. "Formal forms and discernment: two neglected aspects of linguistic Politeness." *Multilingua* 8(2/3): 223-48.
- Gu, Yueguo. 1990. "Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese." *Journal of Pragmatics*. 14 (2): 237-57.
- Mao, Luming. 1992. "Invitational discourse and Chinese identity." *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 3(1):70-96.
- Mao, LuMing. 1994. "Beyond politeness theory: "face" revisited and renewed," *Journal of Pragmatics* 21(5):451-86.
- Matsumoto, Yoshiko. 1988. "Reexamination of the universality of face: politeness phenomena in Japanese." *Journal of Pragmatics* 12(4):403-26.
- Matsumoto, Yoshiko. 1989. "Politeness and conversational universals—observations from Japanese." *Mutilingua* 8(2/3): 207-22
- Mills, Sara. 2003. *Gender and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pan, Yuling, Scollon, Suzanne and Ron Scollon. 2002. *Professional communication in international settings*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Pan, Yuling. 2007. "Cross-cultural Communication Norms and Survey Interviews." Paper presented at the Panel of "Chinese Institutional Discourse" for the 10<sup>th</sup> International Pragmatics Conference. Göteborg, Sweden. July 8-13.
- Pan, Yuling. 2008. "Cross-cultural Communication Norms and Survey Interviews." In Sun, H. and Kádár, D. (eds.) *It's the Dragon's Turn – Chinese Institutional Discourses*. Berne: Peter Lang.
- Pan, Yuling, Ashley Landreth, Alisu Schoua-Glusberg, Marjorie Hinsdale-Shouse, and Hyunjoo Park. 2008. "Cognitive Interviewing in non-English Languages: A Cross-cultural Perspective." Special Invited Paper for the International Conference on Survey Methods in Multinational, Multiregional and Multicultural Contexts. June 25-29, 2008, Berlin, Germany.
- Watts, Richard. 2003. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.



## Cultural and Linguistic Issues in the Construction of the Discourse on Japanese Politeness

PIZZICONI, BARBARA  
SOAS, UK; E-Mail: [bp3@soas.ac.uk](mailto:bp3@soas.ac.uk)

Japanese Politeness is often referred to, in lay discourse, as the quintessence of politeness. The language is rich in honorifics, and native speakers' behaviour is characterized as relatively mannerly and deferential, indirect and diplomatically vague. The discourse on Politeness in scholarly research has by and large attempted to avoid essentialist statements, but it too has emphasized the linguistic affordances of Japanese – its rich repertoire of honorifics – on one hand, and individuals' sensitivity to social hierarchies (Ide's 1989 *wakimae*), social cohesiveness and order (Hofstede 1980, Markus, H.R. and Kitayama, S. 1991) on the other.

As a specialist of a language taken to represent a paradigmatic case of the 'eastern' type of politeness, I will address the theme of the conference by asking the question of whether the empirical evidence available to us after decades of scientific research indeed supports the archetypal characterizations described above, and to what extent a supposed East/West divide in Politeness phenomena can be recognised.

One of the most conspicuous pragmalinguistic features of Japanese is its wealth of honorific devices. If we consider language structure (a language's morpho-syntactic features) a kind of social artefact shaped by and reflecting its users' social concerns, the wealth of honorifics we find in Japanese would suggest the extreme salience of the interactional aspects of language use. Compared to 'western' languages such as English or Italian, Japanese can be said to consistently 'force' its speakers to attend, in discourse, to sociocognitive dimensions (such as, for example, Power and Distance) in relatively more elaborate, more explicit and more pervasive ways.

The 'peculiarity' of Japanese Politeness can be largely attributed to its pragmalinguistic affordances, but no study has to date provided evidence that linguistic, pragmatic and cognitive principles regulating the use of Japanese language are qualitatively and non-trivially different from universal ones. Its distinctiveness can instead be located at the level of (discursive) sociopragmatic norms regulating conduct in communities of practice. I will argue that Japanese has a significant preference for the explicit marking of the utterance's 'situatedness', which includes components such as setting (time, place, circumstances), identity (social and personal attributes, role-relationships of speech event participants), and last but not least affective attitudes. These are universally constrained by normative codifications, and variation can be expected in the nature of underlying ideologies. I will address the issue of culturally specific ideologies of politic behaviour (and in particular the question of their existential loci, whether they are external or internal to speakers), provide a brief illustration of the how these are mediated through language, and consider whether the resulting characterization can be reconciled with the received portrayals of Japanese politeness.

### References:

- Markus, H.R. and Kitayama, S. (1991) Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review* 98, 224–253.  
Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.  
Ide S. (1989). 'Formal forms and discernment: two neglected aspects of linguistic politeness.' *Multilingua* 8(2–3), 223–248



## Politeness Strategies between Doctors and Patients

ADAMS, RACHEL

Department of Primary Care & General Practice, University of Birmingham; E-Mail: [rx513@bham.ac.uk](mailto:rx513@bham.ac.uk)

**Keywords:** healthcare communication; face-threatening-acts; politeness strategies

The use of politeness strategies to avoid face threatening acts (FTAs) are part of everyday interaction (e.g. Goffman 1967, Brown & Levinson 1987). FTAs include initiating dialogue, making suggestions, requests and providing responses. The degree of threat that speakers perceive depends on the act's level of imposition, power relations and social distance between the dyad. Between doctor and patient, there is invariably a wide power differential - by nature of the doctor's expertise and deference afforded to science (Foucault 1963 & 1976), a wide social gap and interactions which are highly threatening/imposing by nature of their intimacy and/or effect on transient choices and long-term, lifestyle choices. This study examines the interplay of face-work and politeness strategies between general practitioners (GPs, also known as family doctors, primary care physicians, community or general physicians/doctors).

Of 90 video recordings collected from 10 GPs in Birmingham, England, 60 have been transcribed. Politeness strategies and FTAs evident in the transcripts have been coded with attention to those sections where patients are invited to do things e.g. be examined or opt for a treatment plan. The data is being examined for patterns in the politeness strategies used by the patients and GPs and how these strategies differ throughout the consultation. Patterns will be compared against variables such as GP style and gender dyads. The aim is to gain an understanding as to which strategies open and close patient involvement. To further illuminate the analysis, the data may be analysed within the framework of other models of face work. Analysis has just commenced and preliminary findings will be available for presentation.

### References:

- Brown P & S Levinson (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
Foucault M (1963). *Naissance de la clinique - une archéologie du regard médical* Paris: PUF (*The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception*)  
Foucault M (1976). *Histoire de la sexualité: Vol I: La Volonté de savoir* Paris: Gallimard (*The History of Sexuality: Vol I: The Will to Knowledge*)  
Goffman E (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior* Garden City NY: Anchor Books.

**Saving or Losing Face with the Judeo-Spanish, Turkish, and Turkish Cypriot Idioms and Proverbs with the Organ of Face**

AGIS, DERYA

The American University of Cyprus, Kyrenia; E-Mail: [deryaagis@gmail.com](mailto:deryaagis@gmail.com)

In this study, I am going to talk about the data I gathered by observing the Judeo-Spanish messages found in a chat-room called "*Ladino komunita*," a Yahoo group on the net, founded by Rachel Bortnick. I analyzed the interaction between native Judeo-Spanish speakers interacting with each other by using some idioms and proverbs that include the body part of face in order to express their negative and positive emotions. The negative emotions include shame, anger, fear, and sadness, and the positive emotions include happiness and love.

This study examines the role of the concept of face and politeness in the Sephardic culture, thus the culture of the Spanish Jews who arrived in the Ottoman Empire after their expulsion from Spain in 1492. One may use a specific Judeo-Spanish idiom or proverb to be polite and to preserve face by maintaining one another's face. Sometimes Judeo-Spanish speakers may refer to idioms and proverbs using some politeness strategies such as indirectness, avoidance of confrontation, the suppression of negative emotions, and praises of one's positive values for not mentioning this person's negative sides so that one cannot lose face. However, some Judeo-Spanish idioms and proverbs with the organ of face may be used to express that one loses face, by becoming ashamed, angry, or sad.

In this study, the uses of the organ of face for indicating different emotions are calculated with a Chi-Square test. The Chi-Square test results show that the organ of face is used in the Judeo-Spanish proverbs and idioms in order to indicate more negative emotions than the positive ones. Therefore, the organ of face is widely used to explain that one loses face.

Furthermore, I compared these results with the uses of the equivalents of these idioms and proverbs by Turkish and Turkish Cypriot university students between the ages of eighteen and thirty. Ten Turkish native speakers and ten Turkish Cypriot dialect native speakers took a multiple choice test of 40 questions that measures the cultural differences in using the organ of face in order to express certain emotions for showing one's politeness or for expressing one's resentment or anger. The participants selected in which situation they would use the idiom or the proverb. This study shows that although people had lived within the borders of the same country, i.e. the Ottoman Empire in the past, today they may prefer to use different politeness terms constructed with the organ of face in order to indicate that one saves face or loses face. Besides, the Conceptual Metaphor Theory of Lakoff and Johnson (1980) is used for explaining the cultural reasons of the statistical differences.

**The Very Model of Epistolary Civility**  
**A Socio-pragmatic Approach to One *Bourgeois-gentilhomme*'s Distinct Uses of Politeness**  
**Strategies in The Context of Early Modern Dutch Letter-writing**

BAX, MARCEL and STREEKSTRA, NANNE

University of Groningen; E-Mail: [M.M.H.Bax@rug.nl](mailto:M.M.H.Bax@rug.nl), [N.F.Streekstra@rug.nl](mailto:N.F.Streekstra@rug.nl)

Our paper is concerned with socio-pragmatic aspects of politeness, in that we shall focus on the issue of how, in a corpus of letters written by the illustrious 17<sup>th</sup>-century Dutch poet, playwright, and historiographer P.C. Hooft, different styles of linguistic politeness hang together with the dissimilar social relationships between the correspondents. On the assumption that, insofar as early modern (Dutch) letter-writing is concerned, Hooft can be taken as a model of politeness, it will be argued that (epistolary) politeness was among the principal “semiotic resources” of that period to reflect, demarcate, or establish (a)symmetrical relations, and that this particular linguistic device bears a close resemblance to, and may even originate from, pre-modern forms of ritual display behaviour.

Pieter Corneliszoon Hooft, who held the important public offices of bailliff of Muiden castle and sheriff of the *Goijsland*, belonged to the upper crust of Dutch society and was part of an elitist social network connecting kindred spirits such as the celebrated poet Constantijn Huygens and the renowned scholar Caspar Barlaeus. Given that Muiden castle was located in the country, whereas the focus of social and cultural life was in major cities like Amsterdam and The Hague, a copious exchange of letters took place between Hooft and a great many correspondents. Over the years, Hooft's ardent letter-writing activities resulted in a vast accumulation of epistolary texts of which as many as 1336 letters from and to Hooft have been preserved.

In our paper, we cannot but limit ourselves to a mere fraction of Hooft's epistolary legacy. Even so, concentrating on politeness phenomena in about forty letters dating from the 1630s and 1640s, we will try to ascertain that this typical early modern bourgeois-gentleman disposed of notably distinctive epistolary styles, which he consistently employed in keeping with particular socio-pragmatic “parameters,” most especially the nature of his relationship with the addressee. Such contextual variables range from the public to the private domain, and encompass professional contacts, business relations, social contacts of a general nature (mostly peer group acquaintanceships), cordial connections with members of a select “inner circle,” as well as family and domestic affairs. It does seem, in effect, that Hooft's various “socio-discoursal roles” played a prominent part as to the selection of the appropriate style of politeness.

Building on our earlier joint research on early modern Dutch *politesse* (Bax & Streekstra 2002, 2003), we will examine the formal characteristics of Hooft's varying styles of politeness, such as the wording of typical epistolary elements (the address, the salutation, the complimentary close), the employed terms of address, and the phrasing of face-threatening acts (primarily requests). Hooft's different styles of epistolary civility will be discussed against a general background of “standard” theories about linguistic politeness (Goffman 1967; Brown & Levinson 1987), along with more recent approaches to (im)politeness such as Culpeper (1996), Burke (2000), Watts (2003), and Bousfield (2007).

Although the point stands that, given its sentence-oriented scope, the standard model is rather lacking in explaining textual aspects of politeness, particularly the “paradigmatic” dimension of polite style-forms, the notions and methods of the current language-and-politeness paradigm are generally well-suited tools for exploring Hooft's distinct uses of politeness strategies, whereas the concepts of positive and negative face can usefully serve to characterize the overall relational stances marked by his divergent letter-writing styles.

To exemplify, Hooft's letters to the Dutch Republic's truly high and mighty are – quite predictably – perfect examples of negatively polite histrionics featuring “the humiliating mode” (Brown & Levinson 1987), whereas in his more practical and professional letters we find comparatively modest forms of negative politeness, but certainly no negatively polite overstatement or uses according to “the hyperbolic mode” (Burke 2000); Hooft's letters to relatives, on the other hand, are in the main positively polite.

In his letters to intimate friends, then again, Hooft tends to intermix apparently incompatible negative and positive politeness strategies. As to the “hybrid” character of such letters – that is, the somewhat paradoxical, outwardly unbalanced co-occurrence of negative and positive politeness –, we suspect that negatively polite ostentation comes down to ritual make-believe, in that subservient phrases and other forms of self-abasement amount to a kind of genial play-acting, rather than to seriously giving deference.

Respecting the presumed ritual quality of the latter variety of epistolary politeness, two antipodal conceptions will be reviewed. The generally acknowledged idea is that over time, and within particular socio-cultural contexts, polite (language) behaviour became “ritualized”; an alternative view is that ritual display was initially the default format of civility, and that, during the early modern period, ritual politeness evolved into a more “rationalized” mode – in the Weberian sense – of relational communication. Referring to medieval examples of (im)politeness, we will argue that pre-modern ritual display and (early) modern civility are contiguous, and historically continuous, semiotic resources for defining interrelations and for marking out the “proxemic space” between interactants.

## When East and West collide: The Use of Politeness Formulas and Forms of Address by Russian Speaking Immigrants in Germany

BREHMER, BERNHARD & FISCHER, KATRIN BENTE

Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of Hamburg;

E-Mails: [bernhard.brehmer@uni-hamburg.de](mailto:bernhard.brehmer@uni-hamburg.de); [katrin.bente.fischer@uni-hamburg.de](mailto:katrin.bente.fischer@uni-hamburg.de)

**Keywords:** politeness formulas; forms of address; language contact; Russian; German

Since the end of the 1980s, due to more liberal regulations concerning the possibility of leaving the countries of the former Soviet Union, a great number of Russian speaking people, mainly of German or Jewish decent, has moved to Germany. Today, they form one of the most considerable linguistic minorities in Germany. Therefore, huge effort is being put into the cultural and linguistic integration of this group into the German society. Linguistic research on the specific situation of Russian speaking immigrants in Germany has so far been concentrated on their problems in acquiring German as a second language. Only recently the interest has shifted towards the outcomes of this contact situation with concern to their first language Russian as well. However, all of the studies only deal with the German influence on the lexical, morphological and syntactical level. Pragmatic phenomena, such as the use of politeness formulas by Russian speaking immigrants, have been thoroughly neglected so far.

This seems quite surprising as contrastive studies have revealed a lot of differences in the way verbal politeness is expressed in German and Russian (see, e.g., Rathmayr 1996a,b, Zemskaja 1997 or Yakovleva 2004). According to the results of these studies, German puts more emphasis on strategies of negative politeness in Brown and Levinson's sense, whereas Russian prefers positive politeness strategies, such as showing warmth, cordiality and solidarity with the addressee. These divergent conceptualizations of how politeness has to be verbally encoded is reflected by significant differences in the selection of verbal means to express various speech acts (requests, apologies, thanks etc.) as well as their frequency of use in everyday encounters. Thus, we may assume that the German environment is likely to leave a trace in the way the immigrants express politeness even when they are using their mother tongue. These deviations from the way politeness is normally expressed in Russian set them apart from their fellows in their homelands. Our paper examines the different outcomes of this contact situation with regard to the use of forms of address and verbal means to express speech acts like requesting, thanking or apologizing. Our observations are based on taped conversations in natural settings as well as on results from a questionnaire study which was conducted with informants living in Russia and Germany. The results of our study reveal strong evidence of German norms determining polite verbal behaviour in the Russian data. Three cases have to be distinguished:

(a) the most evident influence is represented by direct borrowings of forms of address and politeness formulas from German to Russian, e.g. *Frau Graf*, *Vy segodnja videli direktora?* 'Mrs Graf, have you seen the director today?', *danke, chto vse prishli* 'thanks that all of you have come'.

(b) overuse of certain modes of expressing speech acts, which occupy a central position in the German system, whereas their direct counterparts in Russian are restricted to very special settings, e.g. preference of the model *gospodin/gospozha* 'Mr./Mrs.' + last name in addressing others in contrast to the central form of distant address in Russian consisting of first name plus patronymic (in Russia, *gospodin/gospozha* + last name is mainly restricted to addressing strangers, which lack a patronymic). Furthermore, the data reveal an overuse of indirect modes of uttering requests such as *Vy ne mogli by skazat' mne skol'ko vremeni?* 'Could you not tell me what time it is?'. In Russian, preference is given to direct modes of expressing requests, mainly to bare imperative forms of the type *Skazhite (pozhalujsta), skol'ko vremeni!* 'Tell me, (please,) what time it is!'. Indirect modes of the above mentioned type are restricted to very formal settings. Sometimes structural modifications occur, which lead to a further approximation to the German model of expressing requests, e.g. omission of the negative particle *ne* 'not' in indirect request which is impossible in Russian, but corresponds to the most common German form without negation *Könnten Sie* 'Could you'.

(c) higher frequency of occurrence of certain speech acts in everyday encounters. According to the observations of the above mentioned contrastive studies, the frequency of using thanks, apologies or greetings is much higher in German than in Russian, especially in contexts, where the politeness formulas are clearly of a phatic nature. Our subjects revealed a tendency to behave more according to the German rules of conversation, i.e. showed a behaviour, which could be deemed over-polite or even insincere in Russia.

Besides illustrating these different forms of German influence on the use of politeness formulas by Russian speaking immigrants, our paper proposes a model explaining why speakers of Russian resort to direct or structural borrowing of German forms of address and politeness.

### Acoustic Correlates of Politeness

CAMPANA, MARK

Kobe City University of Foreign Studies; E-Mail: [bugsofjapan@yahoo.com](mailto:bugsofjapan@yahoo.com)

ERICKSON, DONNA

Showa University of Music; E-Mail: [Erickson.Donna2000@gmail.com](mailto:Erickson.Donna2000@gmail.com)

CAMPBELL, NICK

National Institute of Information and Communications Technology; E-Mail: [nick@nict.go.jp](mailto:nick@nict.go.jp)

TAKAAKI, SHOCHI

GIPSA Labs, Grenoble

Recent developments in our understanding of the human brain—in particular the role of mirror-neurons—portend some rethink on the topic of politeness. Typically, fMRI experiments seek to locate specific areas of the brain that show activity during periods of observable behavior. Psycholinguistic testing involves elicited judgments of audiovisual stimuli. While useful, neither has offered insight into how pragmatic (im)politeness is processed by the speaker/hearer. Here we consider some acoustic evidence that must figure into any theory (im)politeness—pragmatic as well as neurological.

Research has shown that information in the acoustic wave form, such as voice pitch, intonation pattern, duration, loudness and voice quality (of voice timbre) changes, signal information about a speaker's attitude or emotions, in addition to their choice of lexical items or syntactic structure, etc. Many of the acoustic characteristics seem to be universal, i.e. language- and culturally independent: vocalizations expressing happiness are carried by high pitch and anger by loud voice. Nevertheless, speakers also communicate pragmatic (im)politeness within their dialect group via formally coded acoustic expressions.

Sadanobu (2004) describes a deferential type of politeness (*kyoshuku*) characterized by pressed voice, a quality generated by constriction of vocal fold vibrations; Japanese listeners have a higher rate of recognition than French or American listeners, who ascribe a negative meaning to it, e.g. irritation (cf. Shochi et al. 2008). Polite expressions from a data base of natural Japanese conversation (Campbell, 2002) also suggest that politeness in Japanese is characterized by voice quality changes brought about by a lowering the upper formant frequencies (F2, F3, F4). Essentially, we focus on acoustic and perceptual cues for politeness in Japanese and compare them to patterns found in American English.

The results have implications for language processing. If specialized cells (mirror-neurons) can mimic one individual's reactions to an event that is perceived by another, they should also be capable of accommodating acoustically-driven politeness features. Here we assume this to be the case, and propose a model for representing such pragmatic awareness with a syntax that is similar to other sensory systems (e.g. visual).

#### References:

- Arbib, Michael A. (ed.). *The Handbook of Brain Theory and Neural Networks*, 2nd edition (2003). MIT Press, MA.
- Campbell, N. (2002). JST/CREST Expressive Speech Processing project. [www.isd.atr.jp/esp](http://www.isd.atr.jp/esp).
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth, & Cecelia E. Ford (2004). *Sound Patterns in Interaction: Cross-linguistics Studies from Conversation*. Typological Studies in Language 62. John Benjamins.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E., & M. Selting (1996). *Prosody in Conversation*. Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 12. Cambridge University Press.
- Hirschberg, Julia. 'Pragmatics and intonation'. In *The Handbook of Pragmatics*.
- Horn, Laurence, & Gregory Ward (eds.) *Handbook of Pragmatics*. 2004.
- Levinson, S. (2000). *Presumptive Meanings: The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature*. MIT Press, MA.
- Marantz, A., Y. Miyashita & W. O'Neil (eds.) (2000). *Image, language and brain*. M.I.T. Press. Cambridge, MA.
- Noveck, I., & D. Sperber (eds.). *Experimental Pragmatics*. 2004. Palgrave (Macmillan).
- Ofuka, E., McKeown, J. D., Waterman, M.G., and Roach, P.J. (2000). *Prosodic cues for rated politeness in Japanese speech*. *Speech Communication*, 32, 199-217.
- Peng, Fred C.C. (2005). *Language in the Brain: Critical Assessments*. Continuum, N.Y.
- Sadanobu, T. (2004). 'A natural history of Japanese pressed voice.' *Journal of the Phonetic Society of Japan* 8, 29-44.
- Schluter, Julia (2005). *Rhythmic Grammar: The Influence of Rhythm on Grammatical Variation and Change in English*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Shochi, T., Erickson, D., Rilliard, A., Aubergé, V., Martin, J.-C. (2008). 'Recognition of Japanese attitudes in audio-visual speech'. *Speech Prosody*, 2008.
- Suzuki, Satoko (2006). *Emotive Communication in Japanese*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Tannen, D. (2005). *Conversational style: Talk among friends* (new edition). Oxford University Press.
- Townsend, D., & T. Bever (2001). *Sentence comprehension*. M.I.T. Press. Cambridge, MA.
- Watts, R., S. Ide, & K. Ehlich (eds.). *Politeness in Language*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. (2005). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wichman, Ann (2000). 'The attitudinal effects of prosody, and how they relate to emotion'. Department of Cultural Studies, ms. University of Central Lancashire.

## Politeness Strategies in Business Letters in Late 18<sup>th</sup> Century England and America

CHAEMSAITHONG, KRISDA

University of Houston; E-Mail: [ChaemsaitongK@uhd.edu](mailto:ChaemsaitongK@uhd.edu)

This paper investigates the use of politeness strategies in business letters in late 18<sup>th</sup> century America and England. Drawing on politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1978), the paper analyzes the business letters paying attention to the linguistic realizations of positive and negative politeness strategies. As Fitzmaurice (2002) argues, the letter is “more like a conversation in its affect than one might suppose”, and it consists not only “of conventional or formulaic utterance in order to meet basic expectations of politeness in the course of exchange” but also “of particular locutions expressed and phrases in order to carry out specific tasks that the letter is intended to perform” (23). If the letter is conversational-like in that it responds to the previous letter, and anticipates or sets up the dialogue for another letter, then it means that on some occasions there are possibilities that the writer has to make Face Threatening Acts in his or her letters, just as a speaker may do so during a conversation. Business letters, in particular, features many types of Brown and Levinson’s Face Threatening Acts, including suggestions, requests, order, etc.

The study first investigates “real” and at the same time “ideal” business letters that were supposed to be the “norm” in late 18<sup>th</sup> century Britain and America. I draw my data from the American edition (1797) of “The Complete Letter-Writer Containing Familiar Letter,” (which was published concurrently in England at the time). This 245-page document is in fact a letter writing manual, written for “almost every individual, from the boy at school to the secretary of state” (Preface, 4), containing *inter alia* instructions on how to write letters in general and several specific examples of letters for every day occasions including business letters, love letters, courtship letters, to name but a few. While these examples are meant to be models or patterns which the reader can resort to and rely upon, they are also real letters in the sense that they are composed by “eminent authors” (Preface, 4). Thus, while the letters found therein are ideal linguistic realizations of politeness, they are also realistic realizations too. In addition, to make my corpus of business letters larger, the study examines some business correspondence of John McLoughlin (1784-1857), whose later life was spent taking care of his store that sold food and tools to settlers in Oregon. As a result, he had to make business correspondence with other businessmen. Including McLoughlin’s business letters in my corpus allows us to see whether or not and to what extent, if at all, the “norm” or the “model” prescribed by the authority on the subject is followed in practice.

This study aims to gain a greater understanding of politeness not only in this historical period but also the politeness theory in general, and in particular, in what ways politeness affects and has bearing on the linguistic and rhetoric forms within the letters. In terms of methodology, the study distinguishes two linguistic and pragmatic levels: the formulaic level and content level, both of which establish a particular relationship between the sender and a receiver of the letter in different ways. The former includes the salutation, the opening, the pre-close, the close, and the signature, while the latter includes expressions that can be further categorized as requests, offers, apologies, etc. I distinguish these two levels because while the formulaic level often includes fix phrases, they may also convey “conventional meanings” as a result of repeated uses, as Fitzmaurice (2002: 12) puts it, “the remark, ‘Your servant’ placed at the end of a letter is taken neither as the writer’s acknowledgment of his inferior rank relative to the addressee, nor as a sincere assurance of the writer’s willingness to perform a service to the addressee. Instead, it functions as a conventional signal that the letter is at a close.” On the other hand, the informational content sets up the purpose of, the response to, and/or the stage for the “conversation” that will ensue or that comes before. These two levels will be examined for evidence of mitigation by the sender with respect to which politeness strategies, positive and negative, are chosen. Finally I account for the reason why one is chosen over the other by looking at the relationship of the letter and the sender with the receiver.

### References:

- The Complete Letter-Writer, Containing Familiar Letters on the Most Common Occasions in Life...*  
Brown, P. and S. Levinson. 1978. Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomenon. In E. Goody (ed.) *Questions and Politeness in Social Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 56-331.  
Fitzmaurice, Susan. 2002. *The Familiar Letter in Early Modern English*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.  
Maier, P. 1992. Politeness Strategies in Business Letters by Native and Non-Native English Speakers. *English for Specific Purposes* 11: 189-205.  
Sampson, William (ed.). 1973. *John McLoughlin’s Business Correspondence, 1847-48*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.



**The Cross-cultural Variation of Impoliteness:  
A Study of Face-attack in Impoliteness Events Reported by Students in China, Britain, Germany  
and Turkey**

CULPEPER, JONATHAN

Lancaster University, UK; E-Mail: [j.culpeper@lancaster.ac.uk](mailto:j.culpeper@lancaster.ac.uk)

SCHAUER, GILA

Lancaster University, UK; E-Mail: [g.schauer@lancaster.ac.uk](mailto:g.schauer@lancaster.ac.uk)

MARTI, LEYLA

Boğaziçi University, Turkey

MEI, MEILIAN

Zhejiang University of Technology, China

**Keywords:** impoliteness; cross-cultural pragmatics; facework

Our research investigates Chinese, British, German, and Turkish university students' perceptions of what we will refer to as "impoliteness". There is no claim here that we are investigating on-line perceptions, as our methodology involves retrospection and introspection. Instead, we aim to tap into peoples' knowledge about a specific area of language use and its social implications.

Methodologically, our point of departure is Spencer-Oatey (2002), for which students were asked to record "rapport sensitive" incidents, that is, "incidents involving social interactions that they [the student informants] found to be particularly noticeable in some way, in terms of their relationship with the other person(s)" (2002: 533-4). We devised a report form that was more detailed and focused than Spencer-Oatey's. In particular, unlike Spencer-Oatey who focuses on events that have either a "particularly positive effect" or a "particularly negative effect", we sought to investigate only the latter. One of the most important aspects of the design was to avoid mentioning a label that described the kind of behaviour we are interested in – labels such as "impolite", "rude", "abusive", "aggressive" – because the choice of a particular label may have biased our results towards particular behaviours. Thus, we asked informants to report conversations that had a particular effect on them — conversations in which they "feel bad (e.g. hurt, offended, embarrassed, humiliated, threatened, imposed on, obstructed)". In addition, and unlike Spencer-Oatey, we asked informants to reflect on their reported conversations in a number of specific ways.

A starting point for our analysis of the student reports is Culpeper's (2005) definition of impoliteness, integrating some aspects of Spencer-Oatey's (2000, 2002) "rapport management" (see also Cashman 2006). We consider the extent to which that definition fits the behaviours reported. Then, we analyse our reports in terms of four types of impoliteness: quality face attack impoliteness, social identity face attack impoliteness, equity rights flouting impoliteness and association rights flouting impoliteness (this analysis follows the example of Mei (in preparation)). Our aim is to find out possible similarities and differences between the kinds of impoliteness perceived by the students in the four cultures in terms of face and interpersonal rights, and to reflect on the causes of any differences.

**References:**

- Cashman, Holly (2006). Impoliteness in children's interactions in a Spanish/English bilingual community of practice. *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behaviour* 2(2): 217-246.
- Culpeper, Jonathan (2005). Impoliteness and entertainment in the television quiz show: The Weakest Link. *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behaviour, Culture* 1: 35-72.
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen (2000). Rapport management: A framework for analysis. In: Helen Spencer-Oatey, *Culturally Speaking. Managing Rapport through talk across cultures*. London: Continuum, 11-46.
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen (2002). Managing rapport in talk: Using rapport sensitive incidents to explore the motivational concerns underlying the management of relations. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34: 529-545.

## Reviewing American and Russian Interactional Style using Sociopragmatic Interactional Principles

DEWAARD DYKSTRA, LISA

Clemson University; E-Mail: [ldykstr@clemson.edu](mailto:ldykstr@clemson.edu)

**Keywords:** pragmatics; sociopragmatic interactional principles (SIPs); face

Grice's Conversational Maxims were one of the first attempts to categorize the underlying driving forces for human interaction. Since their inception (1975), they have been applied not only to first language interaction but also to inter- and cross-cultural interaction. These, along with Brown and Levinson's (1987) Universal Politeness principle, which elaborates the concept of face and face wants, have brought analyses of politeness in interaction to the forefront in applied linguistics. The touted universality of these concepts has led them to be much investigated and, at times, much criticized. An ongoing, robust discussion of the concept of face continues, as evidenced by the special issue in the *Journal of Pragmatics* in 2003 that reviewed the claims for universality and the questioning of those claims against the backdrop of Asian languages and cultures. Even now in 2007 the debate of the face model for the description of interactional preferences continues to flourish, with articles investigating the various aspects of face theory abounding in the major journals of the field.

Spencer-Oatey and Jiang (2003), in a replication study of Kim (1994), devised a new way to examine what they called the "impact of culture on language use" (2003: 1633). Their study investigated cultural preferences for interaction that led to the coining of the term "sociopragmatic interactional principles [SIPs]" (ibid). In their study, British and Chinese informants completed a survey in which they were asked to respond to a series of hypothetical request situations. Informants were not asked to provide what they would have responded in each situation, rather they were presented with a series of factors designed to elicit what would motivate their answer, and were asked to rank each factor using a Likert scale response format. In this way, the authors were investigating not what would be said but what was motivating their responses. The factors were submitted to statistical analysis and three factors distinguished themselves as "fundamental", with the implication that they would be universal: (1) Face, (2) Rights and Obligations, and (3) Task. Among the secondary SIPs listed was the Directness-Indirectness contrast. Their article concluded with a call for more empirical research to test the validity of their claims. This paper is just that.

Research on Russian interactional style has found Russians to be direct and to prefer a negative request strategy (Mills, 1993). American English style has been contrasted as the opposite, in that Americans tend to hedge their speech with elaborate indirect phrasing, while at the same time favoring a positive request strategy. Pragmatic transfer has been shown to lead to pragmatic failure for learners of either language attempting to converse in the other, with anecdotal evidence finding Russians to be abrupt and pushy by Americans, and with Americans characterized as weak by Russians. For example, Bergelson (2003) has noted that Russians prefer positive face and that their desire for solidarity leads to greater directness of speech. In an interaction with an American interlocutor for whom negative politeness—or freedom from imposition—is valued, this kind of directness can be off-putting. This paper will test whether these characterizations of Russian and American style can be further elucidated by the application of SIP theory.

In their work, Kim (1994) and Spencer-Oatey and Jiang (2003) used a survey-style test in which respondents were presented with request situations. In this paper, both requests and apologies will be used in an attempt to collect data on more than one type of face threatening act, as well as to allow for comparison with other studies in pragmatics, since the speech acts of requests and apologies are among the most studied. In addition, informants will be asked to respond to all 12 situations (6 requests, 6 apologies) instead of a selection (as in Kim and Spencer-Oatey and Jiang). Also, each informant will be asked to respond to all 12 factors for each situation, for a total of 144 responses per informant. The test will be computerized and situations randomized to reduce potential practice effects, due to the large number of responses being asked of each participant. The instrument will use a secure online format, with data collection scheduled to take place in the United States and in St. Petersburg, Russia, in January and February of 2008. Due to the replicative nature of the study, Kim's (1994) request prompts will be used. Apology prompts are adapted from Dykstra (2006), a project that incorporated the speech act of apologies into a pragmatic test for American learners of Russian. Data collected will be subjected to factor loading statistical analysis.

The results of this project will add to the growing number of studies (Spencer-Oatey, personal communication, March 28, 2006) on SIP theory in the hope that they will add to the explanatory power of this new model as well as elucidate interactions between American English and Russian.

## Politeness and Place in Rural Japanese Women's Evaluative Interactions

DIDI-OGREN, HOLLY

Department of Modern Languages, The College of New Jersey; E-mail: [ogren@tcnj.edu](mailto:ogren@tcnj.edu)

**Keywords:** Japan; dialect; speech levels; evaluation and assessment; place

Approaches to studying (im)politeness in interaction have shifted in recent years to a more situated focus that is informed both by analysts' readings and participants' local understandings (Locher 2005, Watts 2003). In a critical review of this discursive approach to politeness, Haugh (2007a) suggests that a more epistemologically sound focus would be on "interactionally achieved politeness" (2007a: 306), wherein researchers base claims for the presence and/or effects of (im)politeness on the analysis of both sequential (e.g. talk-in-interaction) and non-sequential (e.g. ethnographic) data.

In this paper, I follow Haugh's proposed model in considering the interactional achievement of (im)politeness among participants in face-to-face interactions in a rural, northeastern Japanese community. The analysis focuses on (im)politeness around evaluations made by a female leader of other participants' work in two settings: a story-card making group and a pottery class.

Ethnographic analysis and verbal interactions are used to show how participants use politeness strategies that are "locally" salient in terms of both region and social standing. Specifically, participants' situated use of speech level shifts – not only "polite" or *desu/-masu* and plain forms that have been the focus of much previous politeness research, but also local language variety forms – are shown to be an important means of negotiating role and status. This paper thus adds to Haugh's (2007b) emphasis on "place" as a highly salient notion in conceptualizations of politeness in Japan/Japanese the importance of geographic place as displayed through language choice. Because my interest is in interactionally achieved (im)politeness, I focus on the interactional effects of shifts in these speech levels (cf. Cook 2006), as observed through participants' displays of understanding.

### References:

- Cook, Haruko Minegishi (2006). Japanese politeness as an interactional achievement: Academic consultation sessions in Japanese universities. *Multilingua* 25, 269-291.
- Haugh, Michael (2007a). The discursive challenge to politeness research: An interactional alternative. *Journal of Politeness Research* 3, 295-317.
- Haugh, Michael (2007b). Emic conceptualizations of (im)politeness and face in Japanese: Implications for the discursive negotiation of second language learner identities. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39, 657-680.
- Locher, Miriam (2005). *Power and politeness in action. Disagreements in oral communication*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Watts, Richard J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

## Politeness, Politic Behaviour and Humiliative Discourse in Eighteenth Century English

FITZMAURICE, SUSAN M.

University of Sheffield; E-Mail: [S.Fitzmaurice@sheffield.ac.uk](mailto:S.Fitzmaurice@sheffield.ac.uk)

The panel affords a superb opportunity to explore the extent to which (im)politeness theory as developed and applied in present-day pragmatics and sociolinguistics might be drawn on in the study of the notions of civility and politeness as reflected in humiliative discourse in eighteenth century English.

Much of my work over the past ten years has involved the in-depth study of the linguistic practices and literacy habits of a coalition of eighteenth-century writers centred on the authors of the *Spectator* periodical, Joseph Addison and Richard Steele. I have explored the roles and influences of the social connections forged in the coalition on the language of the individuals involved. I have also more recently turned my attention to considering how social networks differ from discourse communities in the period by focusing on the language of the periodical essay. One common theme of these research projects has been the centrality of the notion of politeness. Crucially, the notion of politeness in the early eighteenth century commands a highly contextually conditioned, historically specific set of meanings; for example, Lawrence Klein's (1996) work on the coffeehouse culture and the conduct of politeness in the period reflects historians' concerns with politeness as a mode of social coordination. Scott Black's (1999) work reflects the literary historian's interest in the extent to which the genre of the periodical essay serves as a discursive medium for the development of sociability in the period. In earlier work, I discussed the emergence of politeness as an identifiable set of attributes that are commercialized and commodified via the identification of good grammar as the way to polite conversation (Fitzmaurice, 1998). Turning to a more linguistically focused stuff of politeness, I have examined the ways in which writers of the period operationalise politeness through the medium of humiliative discourse (Fitzmaurice, 2002a, b, c).

In the paper for the panel, I plan to take these historically specific explorations of the ideology of politeness, and examine the discourses that are argued to represent politeness in light of politeness theory and the notion of face (Brown & Levinson, 1987, etc.). I also want to assess the relevance of politeness theory in accounting for the conduct of eighteenth century 'politeness' in terms of Richard Watts' (2003) exploration of politic behaviour.

To this end, I will examine two textual domains in which (the now highly complex notion of) politeness dominates, namely in the periodical press and in the sociable letter. I plan to explore politeness in the exponents of these domains as represented in the Network of early Eighteenth-century English Texts (NEET), the database that informs most of my work in eighteenth century English language. The key here is that the practice of letter writing and the idea of epistolarity are crucial to the performance of politeness in the period. The periodical as represented by the *Spectator* is composed of essays presented as letters, a practice that persists in the editorial and in letters to the editor in present-day periodical publications. The epistolary format invites the assumption of interaction—the presence of an addressee to whom the writer pays constant attention. It is in this context that the contemporary pragmatician's understanding of politeness (via face) interacts with the notions of humiliative discourse and civil language (Burke, 2000). The question for investigation is how a historical pragmatic account of these discourses can profit from or be usefully informed by a social historical perspective, and how a historical assessment of the cultural weight of politeness might be informed by a linguistic perspective. Thus I am interested in complicating and historicising our understanding of politeness in earlier periods of English so that we take adequate account of the conventions that are agreed constitute politic behaviour as performed in the early eighteenth century.

### References:

- Black, Scott (1999) 'Social and Literary Form in the *Spectator*'. *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 33.1. 21-42.  
Brown, P & Levinson, S.C. (1987) *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
Burke, Peter (2000) 'A civil tongue: language and politeness in early modern Europe'. In P. Burke, B. Harrison & P. Slack (eds.) *Civil Histories: essays presented to Sir Keith Thomas*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 31-48.  
Fitzmaurice, Susan (1998) 'The commerce of language in the pursuit of politeness in eighteenth-century England' *English Studies*. Vol. 79, No. 4. 1998: 309-328.  
Fitzmaurice, Susan (2002a) *The Familiar Letter in Early Modern English: A pragmatic approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishers (*Pragmatics & Beyond* series vol. 95)  
Fitzmaurice, Susan (2002b) 'Politeness and modal meaning in the construction of humiliative discourse in an early eighteenth-century network of patron-client relationships'. *English Language and Linguistics* 2002. 6.2: 239-65.  
Fitzmaurice, Susan (2002c) Servant or Patron? Jacob Tonson and the language of deference and respect. *Language Sciences* 24:3-4. 2002. 247-260.  
Klein, Lawrence E. (1996) 'Coffeehouse Civility, 1660-1714: An aspect of post-courtly culture in England. *The Huntington Library Quarterly* 59.1. 30-51.  
Watts, Richard (2003) *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

## Facework and Event Description in Japanese Multi-party Discourse

GEYER, NAOMI

University of Wisconsin-Madison; E-Mail: [nfgeyer@wisc.edu](mailto:nfgeyer@wisc.edu)

Current politeness research is moving away from the original models (e.g., Brown and Levinson 1987), advancing the view of politeness as a discursive phenomenon (e.g., Eelen 2001, Mills 2003, Watts 2003). This significant paradigm shift has triggered new approaches to the notion of face, a central theme in Brown and Levinson's politeness theory. However, the problem of devising an empirically grounded analytical framework for politeness and facework remains. Recognizing this challenge, this paper is concerned with the validation of the analysis of face in naturally occurring discourse. Instead of paying primary attention to participants' psychological mechanisms, which are difficult to capture in discourse, this study adopts a conversation analytic (as used in discursive psychology) and ethnographic approach. Informed by discursive psychology's respecification of psychological elements in terms of discursive reality, it reconsiders the notion of face and facework as discursively constructed phenomena.

Applying this new approach, the paper examines one type of social action—event description—situated in Japanese institutional multi-party discourse (i.e., a faculty meeting in a Japanese secondary school). Even though event description appears to be face-neutral, researchers have pointed out its action orientation. For instance, Potter (1996) illustrates procedures for fitting descriptions to activities, stating that description is a practical and rhetorical accomplishment that plays a role in activities. The action-oriented nature of description suggests that some type of facework can be achieved through this rhetorical practice.

This paper demonstrates how participants (teachers) display their face (i.e., their interactional self-image) as a responsible, motivated and/or knowledgeable teacher, and how they build alliance and solidarity. It also discusses how a speaker's invoked membership categorization as well as the foregrounding of certain aspects of an event can be instrumental in displaying his or her face.

The observation of facework provides insights into participants' conception of institutional face shared within their community of practice: the discursive practice of event description reveals what behaviors and attitudes receive positive evaluation in the case of a school emergency. These discursively negotiated evaluations are closely linked to participants' discursive construction of face. The analysis suggests that event description sequences represent instances in which a tacit conception of positive institutional face becomes observable in discourse, and that facework can be depicted as a discursive process in which face ascriptions are negotiated, contested, and altered.

---

## The Southern African Concept of 'Face' and its Relevance to Intercultural Interaction

GRAINGER, KAREN

MILLS, SARA

SIBANDA, MANDLA

Sheffield Hallam University; E-Mail: [K.P.Grainger@shu.ac.uk](mailto:K.P.Grainger@shu.ac.uk)

Current debates around Brown and Levinson's (1978; 1987) concept of face largely draw on the distinction between 'Western' and 'Eastern' languages. In general, British and North American face considerations are thought to be based on individualist assumptions whereas the Far Eastern notion of face is based on collectivist assumptions which may not be very amenable to Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness. Africa has been largely overlooked in these discussions but some recent scholarship in South Africa suggests that the concept of face and the notion of self in black southern African culture may have more in common with Eastern collectivist cultures than with Anglo-American culture. There are also some unique aspects to the southern African face which can be related to the Zulu notions of 'hlonipha' (deference) and 'ubuntu' (tact) and which deKadt claims promotes public face over private or collective face needs.

It might be expected, then, that 'face-to-face' encounters between southern Africans and people from 'Western' cultures could result in misunderstandings and clashes. This paper examines the nature of intercultural communication between Zimbabwean English speakers and British English speakers in the context of a community singing group in the UK. Using naturally-occurring interactional data, supplemented by interviews, we analyse the sociolinguistic behaviours and interpretations exhibited by the Zimbabwean group leader and British group members. In particular, we examine the ways in which 'face' is negotiated in a situation where a southern African speaker gives direction to British participants whose expectations are, arguably, those of an individualistic culture. However, in our discussion we question the extent to which the notion of face can be dichotomized and reduced to a culturally relative phenomenon.

## **Does East Meet West in Electronic Language?: Examples from Turkish and British English**

HATİPOĞLU, CILER

Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey; E-mails: [ciler2@yahoo.com](mailto:ciler2@yahoo.com), [ciler.hatipoglu@gmail.com](mailto:ciler.hatipoglu@gmail.com)

**Keywords:** electronic language; apologies; Turkish; British English; cross-cultural communication

Every community has its specific norms of writing and speaking and the norms of interaction valid in the community are taught to or absorbed by its members from very early age. Members of each culture learn that the rules of apologising, requesting and/or complimenting in spoken language, for instance, are different from the ones in written language. In the last few decades, however, a new medium of interaction – the e-mail – has entered our lives and research on computer mediated discourse shows that this new modality brings with itself rules that are different from the ones valid in the other more traditional mediums of engagement (Hatipoğlu 2004, 2006a). Some researchers examining electronic interaction call attention to the fact that the new medium fosters globalisation of cultures and that some of the rules followed in spoken and written language in the particular communities may not be observed or are partly bent in computer mediated discourse (Hatipoğlu 2007; St.Amant 2002; Tehranian 1998).

The current study aims to contribute to the examination of this claim by comparing the electronic apologies sent by groups of students that belong to two distinct cultures – Turkish and British – to their lecturers for the same types of offence. Apologies were chosen as focal speech acts in this study mainly due to two reasons: first, since remedial acts have been described as ‘culture sensitive’ speech acts (Suszcynska 1999:1053) that are called for when the social norms in a particular society are violated (Olshtain & Cohen 1983); and second, since studies on the spoken and written norms of apologising in Turkish and British cultures have shown that there are notable differences between the rules of apologising in the two communities (Hatipoğlu 2003, 2006b) and that the differences stem mainly due to the differences in the social structure in those two societies. Great Britain is a part of the ‘developed Western’ world (Ashkanasy et al. 2002:28-29) and it is described as an ‘individualistic, low power distance society’ by Hofstede (2001). What is more, it is an example ‘negative politeness cultures’ in Brown and Levinson’s (1987) work. Turkish culture, on the other hand, is classified as a ‘collectivist high power distance culture’ by Hofstede (2001) but as Hayasi (1998) puts it there is nothing simple about Turkey. Turkey spans over Europe and Asia, and connects the Black Sea to the Mediterranean. To understand the diversity of Turkey’s cultural influences, we have to consider its bordering states: Greece and Bulgaria to the west, Syria and Iraq to the south, Iran, Armenia and Georgia to the east, and north across the Black Sea, Romania, Ukraine and Russia. This geography means that it is uniquely positioned between the European Union (EU) and the Arab World, and between the European and Asian markets including the Turkish-speaking former Soviet Union Republics (Akar 2002:306).

The Turkish and British corpora of apologies examined in this study were collected between 2000 and 2007. The corpora consist of naturally occurring apologies (i.e., none of the apologies was solicited by the researcher) sent via e-mail by students (all of whom were native speakers of Turkish or British English) to their lecturers. The Turkish and British electronic apologies selected for this study cover a similar range of topics (e.g., missing a deadline or class, being late, failing/missing exams, not coming to a predetermined meeting) and usually occur alongside other speech acts. The quantitative analysis of the data aims to uncover the major apology strategies in both corpora, the ways in which apologisers with different cultural backgrounds choose to combine the available strategies and the speech acts which usually accompany the apologies in e-mails. The qualitative analysis tries to find out whether or not, as predicted by some researchers, computer mediated discourse manages to break down/bend cultural boundaries and whether or not East really meets West in electronic apologies.

The results of the study show that, similarly to spoken and written language, the type and the number of the apologies used in e-mails might be affected by the structural features of the language (e.g., Turkish and English) and the context within which the communication takes place. The analysis also demonstrate that with the widespread use of electronic messages new apology formulae not encountered in spoken and written interactions have been introduced into Turkish and British English.

## Face, Culture and Interaction

HAUGH, MICHAEL

Griffith University; E-Mail: [m.haugh@griffith.edu.au](mailto:m.haugh@griffith.edu.au)

A key issue facing researchers making recourse to face in their analyses of social phenomenon is arguably the progressive dichotomisation of second-order (or face2) and first-order (or face1) notions of face (cf. the distinction between first-order and second-order politeness: Eelen (2001: 30-48); Watts, Ide and Ehlich (1992: 3-4)). However, while face1 is often equated with folk or emic notions of face (Haugh and Hinze, 2003: 1582; Haugh, 2007: 302; O'Driscoll, 1996: 8; Ruhi and Işık, 2007: 684; Terkourafi, 2007: 315-316), face can also be conceptualised as being grounded in the participant's perspective, as opposed to that of the analyst. In other words, in applying the first-order/second-order distinction we need to ensure we do not conflate a finer distinction, namely that between (first-order) *emic* perspectives, where the aim is to 'understand speech practices which make sense to the people concerned, i.e., in terms of indigenous values, beliefs and attitudes, social categories, emotions, and so on' (Goddard, 2006: 2), and (first-order) *participant* perspectives, where the aim is to understand 'the participants' orientations to meanings, interpretations and evaluation of utterances' (Piirainen-Marsh, 2005: 214). While the notion of *wakimae* (translated as 'discernment') invoked by Ide (1989) in place of Brown and Levinson's (1987) *etic* (or 'universal') notion of face to account for politeness in Japanese is culture-specific and so emic in nature, for example, Ide makes no claim that her analyses would be understood as such by the participants in interactions. In fact, Ide seems to not consider the participant's perspective at all, apparently comfortable with her status as a 'cultural-insider' to justify her analyses. However, to make recourse to folk or emic notions of face without proper consideration of their (ultimate) grounding in interaction may simply led to a reification of such first-order notions. What has been missing in much work to date, therefore, is a deeper consideration of the intervening level of interaction. In this paper, then, it is proposed that by placing interaction at the centre of the analysis of face – echoing Bargiela-Chiappini's re-opening of discussion about face in her 2003 article – (new) insights may be gained into these (old) debates.

### References:

- Bargiela-Chiappini, F. (2003) Face and politeness: new (insights) for (old) concepts. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35: 1453-1469.
- Eelen, G. (2001) *A Critique of Politeness Theories*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Goddard, C. (2006) Ethnopragmatics: a new paradigm. In C. Goddard (ed.) *Ethnopragmatics. Understanding Discourse in Cultural Context* 1-30. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haugh, M. (2007) The discursive challenge to politeness theory: an interactional alternative. *Journal of Politeness Research* 3: 295-317.
- Haugh, M. and Hinze, C. (2003) A metalinguistic approach to deconstructing the concepts of 'face' and 'politeness' in Chinese, English and Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35: 1581-1611.
- Ide, S. (1989) Formal forms and discernment: two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua* 8: 223-248.
- O'Driscoll, J. (1996) About face: A defence and elaboration of universal dualism. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25: 1-32.
- Piirainen-Marsh, Arja. (2005) Managing adversarial questioning in broadcast interviews. *Journal of Politeness Research* 1: 193-217.
- Ruhi, S. and Işık-Güler, H. (2007) Conceptualizing face and relational work in (im)politeness: revelations from politeness lexemes and idioms in Turkish. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 681-711.
- Terkourafi, M. (2007) Toward a universal notion of face for a universal notion of cooperation. In I. Kecskes and L. Horn (eds.) *Explorations in Pragmatics: Linguistic, Cognitive and Intercultural Aspects* 313-344. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Watts, R., Ide, S. and Ehlich, K. (1992) Introduction. In R. Watts, S. Ide and K. Ehlich (eds.) *Politeness in Language. Studies in its History, Theory and Practice* 1-17. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

**‘Buzz off’ or ‘Thank you’? Responses to Compliments in Contemporary Chinese**

HE, YUN

Department of English and Drama, Loughborough University, UK; E-Mail: [Y.He3@lboro.ac.uk](mailto:Y.He3@lboro.ac.uk)

**Keywords:** compliments; responses; politeness; Chinese

Theories of politeness formulated by Western theoreticians like Lakoff (1973), Brown and Levinson (1987), Leech (1983) and Watts (2003) are, implicitly or explicitly, claimed to be universal across languages and cultures. Brown and Levinson’s model is, for example, the one that most clearly maintains its pan-cultural validity in cross-cultural studies (O’Driscoll 1996) despite much counterevidence that has been found in many non-Western cultures. Compared with Western colleagues, politeness scholars from the East seem more inclined to test out or modify the existing theories. For instance, Gu’s (1990) theory, distilled from millennia’s Chinese cultural tradition, is obviously a follower of Leech’s maxim approach. Nevertheless, his culture-specific theory is still likely to be empirically challenged because politeness in Chinese always seems on the move. As has been observed by both Western and Chinese practitioners of politeness (e.g., Wierzbicka 1986, Gu 1990 and Pan 2000), no research on Chinese politeness can afford to ignore linguistic change if it is meant to capture the full picture. This can well explain why Gu in his theorization mentions several times the palpable changes of politeness though he reassures readers that the essential notions underlying the Chinese conceptions of politeness remain intact. Despite this, Gu’s reminder suggests that the dynamic nature of Chinese politeness always seems in a position to creep into any explanation for linguistic behaviour.

Therefore, my paper, as a preliminary result of my ongoing PhD research, aims (1) to discover similarities and differences between the younger and older generations in politeness strategies in responding to compliments, and provide empirical evidence for or against any deviation of the younger generation’s politeness behaviour from their counterparts in the same speech interactions; (2) to identify, if any, the weakening or tightening of the Self-denigration Maxim, which Gu argues is most Chinese culture-specific; and (3) to attempt to account for the underlying reasons.

To achieve this, questionnaires are designed according to the findings of Wolfson and Manes’ (1980) study that most of compliments focus on appearance, possessions, abilities and accomplishments. Then they are distributed to subjects from both generations in four cities across the mainland of China.

Statistics of the questionnaire data indicate that there is a significant difference between two generations under study in their preference of politeness strategies manifested in their responses to compliments in the four situations. First, as expected, the younger subjects tend to use the self-denigrating strategy much less than their older counterparts, who are readier to denigrate themselves while elevating interlocutors. That is to say, the constraint of what Gu calls a maxim most characteristic of politeness in Chinese on two generation groups’ responses is unequal in weight: the younger respondents are now generally happy to accept compliments, particularly on their looks and clothes.

Second, when analyzed within Gu’s and Leech’s theoretical frameworks of politeness, Gu’s Self-denigration Maxim explains most of the responses from the older generation and Leech’s Modesty Maxim and Agreement Maxim account for all the responses from two generations. To some degree, I might venture to assume that Gu’s Maxim of Self-denigration appears somewhat generation-specific in Chinese compliments responding practice, though further in-depth substantiations are needed.

Responses of an increasing number of Chinese, especially of the young, are highly motivated by Leech’s Agreement Maxim. The young have a larger repertoire of politeness formulae and use them frequently in responding to compliments partly as a result of the observation that a new value system has been emerging in China since the inception of socio-economic reform in the late 1970s, under which self-denigration is often evaluated negatively amongst the younger generation.

Lastly, selection of responding strategies to compliments is to a large degree determined by the contexts. Although the younger subjects agree with their complimenters more often, both groups accept compliments more readily in equal encounters, e.g., between friends and colleagues, but tend to refuse or appear hesitating in accepting superiors’ compliments no matter whether they are on appearance, clothes, possessions or achievements. In other words, traditional politeness features seem to prevail in formal and unequal interactions.

Changes in politeness triggered by socio-economic transformations may sometimes be amazingly enormous as shown by Bencze (2005). The similarities and differences between two generations in responding to compliments in the four situations can be attributed to fundamental changes in social structure, cultural values and norms brought about by such overlapping socio-cultural factors as launching of the open door policy, democracy reform, market economy, and one-child policy (Zheng 1995, Ouyang 2006).

As Chen (1993) suggests, ‘thank you’ is an American’s conventionalized response to the compliment ‘you are so pretty’ just as ‘buzz off’ is a Chinese typical reaction to ‘*ni tai piaoliang le* (you are so pretty)’. My research findings show that Chinese responding to compliments seems to be undergoing a move from ‘buzz off’ to ‘thank you’. In this sense, politeness behaviour of Chinese, especially of the younger generation, seems to have embarked on a process of Westernization due to multiple socio-cultural reasons.



## **Supplica la mia parvidade ... Petitions in Medieval Societies – A Matter of Ritualized Politeness?**

HELD, GUDRUN

University of Salzburg; E-Mail: [Gudrun.Bachleitner-Held@sbg.ac.at](mailto:Gudrun.Bachleitner-Held@sbg.ac.at)

This paper focuses on the practice of *petitioning* as an important part of official medieval writing culture. One purpose is to define the text genre in the political, cultural and religious context of early modern societies – mainly those of Northern France and Italy – and to identify its particular character at the intersection of universality vs. specificity and stability vs. change. The other objective is to challenge some of the main hypotheses from the socio-pragmatic theory of politeness.

Being a formalized requesting act Supplication, or officially begging a favour from the authorities, is a formalized request and thus can be understood as a hard face-threatening act, which has ever since been deliberately toned down by a range of ritualized redressive actions. These are strongly determined by the rights and duties of a hierarchical society order and the hence imposed social ranks.

The corpus consists of four edited and commented volumes of *petitiones* of the period between the late 13<sup>th</sup> and the early 15<sup>th</sup> century, namely, two collections of the Anglo-Norman era (Tanqueray, F.J.ed.: *Receuil de lettres Anglo-françaises* (1265 – 1399), Paris 1916 and Legge, D. ed.: *Anglo-Norman Letters and Petitions from All-Souls Ms.* (1390 – 1412), Oxford 1941) and two from the era of the Della Scala and Gonzaga in Northern Italy (Bertoletti, N., *Testi veronesi dell'età scaligera*. Padova 2005; Tomasin, L., *Testi padovani del Trecento*. Padova 2004). Italy being the birthplace of the *ars dictandi* the comparative study of ca. 500 petitions is associated with the tightly structured petition-models of Guido Faba's rhetoric handbook from 1250 and will, therefore, be conducted from the pedagogical viewpoint.

First, a comparative analysis of the data is undertaken within Fairclough's three dimensional framework which allows the texts to be interpreted as complex, context-shaped activities with particular structures, contents and style cues. Petitions are therefore likely to be:

1. A social practice displaying the most significant socio-political and ideological factors, such as social status, the relationship between imperial and ecclesiastical influence and its consequences to the concept of power and submission, the situation of law and order, for one. For another the practice is conditioned by behaviour constraints like spirit of deference and sense of courtesy, or the mutual knowledge of consideration forms, etc. Both are mostly understood and explained as universals of medieval society.
2. A discursive practice concerning text production, distribution and consumption which, in my case, involves the definition of the genre on the threshold between orality and literacy; the description of the act of supplication as an ancient metaphorical gesture of prostration consisting in the two ritual parts to be put on semiotically: the petitioner's humility and the benefactor's graciousness. The practice also demonstrates the rise in literacy as an effect of *ars dictandi* and the rhetoric of early letter writing; the relation to charters and diplomas and – last but not least – the description of mediation forms and their influences on textual structure and the different writing styles.
3. A textual practice as the result of the social and cultural constraints on continuous self-humbling and raising of others, which is reflected in a wide range of visible instruments such as materialization, iconicity and verbalisation, viz. text composition and rhetorical and argumentation structure (f.ex. *salutatio* – *exordium* – *narration* – *petition* – *conclusion*), the complex prolix syntactic structure due to the continuous constraints on justification, grounding and submissive recipient design, the striking directness, the high use of formulaic expressions and the widely formalized language of entreaty (like address and kinship terms and other forms of 'social semantics') nevertheless deliberately distributed in the different text parts required. Selected areas like salutation, the use of *verba dicendi* and the range of petition-formulas will be especially scrutinized.

Second, the resulting tendencies are linked to and evaluated with the dominant research paradigm of linguistic politeness established by Brown & Levinson (1978/87) and its continuing reception. My study confirms their main hypothesis: i.e.

1. the identification of the face-notion as a result of social constraints;
2. the ritual face wants and the implied balance between self and other;
3. the necessary conflict avoidance strategies for the classical face-threatening area of request in accordance to ancient rhetorical rules;
4. the importance of verbal cues as one aspect of polite markedness, which needs however to be completed by textual and semantic underpinnings.

The realisation of supplications also shows up a deliberate variation between (formulaic) uniformity and emerging free style conventions according either to the different writing cultures and their institutions or to the different subjects and their social position. These findings provide an appropriate basis to challenge some of the theory's deficits which have ever since been the cause of critical discussion. Among those critical points are:

1. the deficiencies of either historical or written politeness studies implying an epistemic turn from interaction to text and text genres;
2. the cultural notions of face and the coverage of universality in terms of diachronic verticality vs. cross-cultural synchronicity, on the one hand, and
3. the review of the conceptualisations of politeness and its extension and markedness, on the other.

From the beginning of politeness research in the late 70s this latter point has always been subject to different interpretations. They range from everyday meaning (*first-order politeness*) and meta-theoretical implication (*second-order politeness*) in the complete lack of its natural historical inferences thus giving way to dicotomic conceptions like social politeness vs. tact (Arndt/Janney 1992 ff.) over *wakimae* vs. volition (viz. Ide representing the Japanese research 1990ff.) to conventional or social politeness vs. reflected behaviour (Haferland/Paul 1996) and the resulting discussion around the fuzzy problem of politeness vs. impoliteness vs. non-politeness, which some tried to resolve by introducing the concept of politic behaviour (by Watts 1992 to 2003).

Considering the tight and dynamic relationship between the three dimensions in Fairclough's framework, the study of medieval supplications will not only shed light on the historicity of speech acts in terms of stability and change of the compositional, ideational and interactional meaning but also on the modulation of human interaction depending on context and time. The findings prove the importance of rhetoric to modern pragmatics. They reveal highly persistent behavioural patterns which, however, materialize in varying forms. The study is thus a revisitation of politeness theory which highlights functional continuity over time and formal diversity.

**‘Eighty please’: Relational and Remedial Practices in Service Encounters on Urban Bus Services**

HEWITT, HEATHER

University of Edinburgh; E-Mail: [heatherh@ling.ed.ac.uk](mailto:heatherh@ling.ed.ac.uk)

**Keywords:** remedial ritual; relational practice; service encounter

This paper considers the relational and remedial practices of drivers and passengers on pay-as-you-enter bus services in one Scottish city. The structure of the talk in these motorised service encounters differs according to the physical mediational means which are used, for example whether passengers show a bus pass or buy a ticket, but exchanges are typically very brief, have a strong task focus and consist of routinised two or three word exchanges.

Although to some extent predictable, the use of routine institutional forms in these encounters differs by participant and situation type, showing subtle variation as speakers negotiate roles, identities and local contingencies. Variation can be observed, for example, in rapport-building behaviour such as small talk, which appears to be subject to strong generic constraints, and in the performance of remedial rituals such as greeting, requesting and thanking, which are enacted far more frequently by passengers than by drivers.

It is suggested that these salient relational and remedial characteristics point to a social and interactional environment in which drivers, putting efficiency before courtesy, depersonalise passengers as they focus on maintaining their company's operational commitment to run its buses on time, while passengers, acknowledging the situational authority of drivers, treat them as avatars of power.

## Confucian Frame as a New Communication Framework for Inter-cultural Research on Politeness:

HONG, JIN-OK

Nottingham Trent University; E-Mail: [jjin-ok.hong@ntu.ac.uk](mailto:jjin-ok.hong@ntu.ac.uk)

**Keywords:** Cultural frame; individual frame; ideological thinking (Confucianism); scientific mechanism; meta pragmatic aspects of discourse/politeness

Politeness research can be classified as four contrasting views: 1) the traditional view (Grice and Searle) 2) the socio-pragmatic view (Blum-Kulka, Fukushima, Pizziconi, and Okamura) 3) the post modern view (Eelen, Watts, and Locher) and 4) the spoken discourse view (Pan & Kang). The traditional theorists tend to employ Grice's four Maxims, which stress rule governed conversation. Grice's cooperative principle (CP) suggests that language is simply separate, mechanical, and summative encoding/decoding system (Arundale, 2006: 196). It is only concerned with normative linguistic behavior, not deviant language use that is regulated by other dimensions (Arundale, 2006: 194).

The traditional theories miss that when a speaker is strategically motivated, social norms become interactional and functional (Arundale, 2006: 202). Moreover, when this happens, a speaker's underlying ideological knowledge and subjective stance can manipulate face in a functional and / strategic way. Postmodern theorists, on the other hand, emphasize the necessity of naturally occurring data (Terkourafi, 2005: 248). They focus on empirical and contested norms that operate in discourse contexts (Terkourafi, 2005: 243) without denying the existence of shared norms (Terkourafi, 2005: 243).

The postmodern theorists stress the participants' particular interpretations and actions in specific contexts rather than the analyst's personal theoretical concepts (Eelen, 2001; Mills, 2003; Watts, 2003; Terkourafi, 2005: 255; Arundale, 2006; Haugh, 2007). For postmodern theorists, norms are not homogeneous entities, but rather heterogeneous and versatile, since they are subjective, argumentative/discursive, operational and evaluative in nature (Eelen, 2001: 243, 255). The level of local interaction, where meaning is contextually negotiated, is the locus of the postmodern approach (Terkourafi, 2005: 255). However, the critical flaw of the postmodern approach is that they (especially Watts and Locher) do not deny the existence of shared norms. The postmodern theorists observe politeness that is regulated by the existent social norms. They explore empirical norms from an analysts' perspective, not a participant's one. They could thus hardly explore perceptions and conscious statements that are reflected in meta-linguistic behavior (Terkourafi, 2005: 248), because they did not employ interactional model as a methodological framework. The "process-oriented" approach therefore fails to capture the operational nature of these forms (Mills, 2003: 38) or the changing interactional norms. For instance, Watt's and Locher's shortcomings can be mainly attributed to the fact that their model cannot see that cultural script (Confucian frame) plays more important roles than the linguistic devices in the negotiation of politeness and power. They neglect to see that social norms can be functional when interacting with constantly changing interactional goals (Mills, 2003: 38).

It can be argued that Confucian framework is needed to understand these functional, interactional and ideological aspects of politeness. In Korean, culturally shared ideological thinking heavily influences the way Korean talk about politeness and behaves politely. Confucian paradigm is another 'R' variable that influences politeness in action. I would claim that Terkourafi's "frame based" view is instructive (Terkourafi, 2005: 248), because cultural knowledge directly influences the renegotiations of power and distance. In my study's data, a speaker's 'scientific mechanism' is governed by two kinds of knowledge: individual frame (Locher's 'habitus') and cultural script. These two frames of knowledge spontaneously work together to affect politeness and influence the ways that speakers conceptualize and perceive politeness especially on an interactional level. Individual frame and cultural script co-exist in Korean people's minds and simultaneously work in the construction of (im) polite behavior. Cultural script focuses more specifically on ways of thinking or interpreting actions that are culturally shared, rather than individual frames formed through personal experience. The individual frame stresses empirically acquired social practice through a participant's own past experiences. In other words, participants' individual interactional frames ('habitus') are anchored to cultural scripts that are extremely dependent on local norms. In contrast to Eelen's view, the functional elements of habitus and cultural script work together to mutually support a speaker motivated by personal interest. These two culturally specific frames affect politeness and the ways that Korean speakers conceptualize and discuss politeness as a social phenomenon.

Meta-pragmatic discourse relies on culture-specific ideological values that are sensitive to interactional norms. Cultural scripts, such as Confucianism, simultaneously work with verbal redress mechanisms and influence the ways Korean people understand and talk about politeness (Arundale, 2006: 194; Haugh, 2007: 313). The variability of individual behavior therefore cannot be properly observed by looking at individual frame alone, because the speaker's and the hearer's interpretations in particular interactional contexts heavily depend on culturally understood thinking. The Korean informant's conscious statements about politeness are closely interlinked with culture-specific ideological thinking (Confucianism) and socio-cultural contexts when making evaluation of (im) politeness of his or her own or someone else's behavior. The conscious operation of the participants' understandings/evaluations interplays with culturally shared knowledge and characterizes the emergence of (im) politeness in the sequential unfolding of interaction (Haugh, 2007: 312). In order not to miss meaningful realities that are derived from the conscious statement of the participants', I suggest cultural ideological framework be incorporated into Brown and Levinson's politeness formula in order to capture the meta-pragmatic aspects of politeness. The new framework that is an interactional alternative to the existent politeness research should integrate both individual and cultural frames in order to better explore face, face work and politeness that emerge from culture-specific meta-discourse.

## Developing and Negotiating Different Views via E-Mail

HSIEH, SHIN-CHIEH

University of Birmingham; E-Mail: [sxh480@bham.ac.uk](mailto:sxh480@bham.ac.uk)

**Keywords:** speech act theory; politeness theory; discourse analysis; relational work

This study combines intercultural (im)politeness and speech act study with computer-mediated communication and examines how Chinese speakers and English speakers negotiate meaning. The pragmatic aspect of language use has attracted many research attentions since the late 60s (see Austin, 1969; Searle, 1969; Hymes, 1974). Language study begins to move beyond linguistics into meta-communication. It has become a research interest to investigate how and what we do with words. This pragmatic view of language use has, since then, been extensively investigated within the field of politeness (such as Leech, 1983 and Brown and Levinson, 1987). Among the politeness research, there seems to be a difficulty to reach a consensus on what is considered “polite” or “impolite”. Meier (1995:345) argues that the state of politeness research is still in “disconcerting amount of divergence and lack of clarity concerning the meaning of politeness”. The difficulty in having a unifying view on (im)politeness is because that the judgment of (im)politeness is subject to change in different situations with different people. Spencer-Oatey H. also suggests that “linguistic politeness needs to be studied within the situated social psychological context in which it occurs” (2002:530). Janney and Arndt (1992) further points out that ‘politeness’ is a process which revolves around human face wants. They asserts that the face wants transcend “cultural, ethnic, social, sexual, economic, geographic and historical boundaries” (p. 27-28). In other words, the meaning of (im)politeness should be considered as an ongoing process which is negotiated and understood by the participants who are involved in the interaction. Although the topic of (im)politeness has been discussed in many face-to-face cultural studies, little work has been carried out on ‘rules of appropriateness’ (Hymes, 1974) in e-mail intercultural communication. The purpose of this study is to investigate how (im)politeness is constructed and negotiated between Chinese and English speakers in email communication. It considers such issues as the role of this particular mediating technology, the cultural background of participants and other identity factors. The research shows how participants mediate (mis)understandings through email technology. Using the analytical frameworks of Searle’s speech act theory (1969) and Brown and Levinson’s politeness theory (1987), 326 number of email messages in this pair are analysed to understand how interactants engage in presentation of self (Goffman, 1967). The term ‘discourse informed interpretative study’ describes the interpretation of the qualitative data collected from the participants’ email interactions. This study involves nine Chinese speakers from Taiwan and nine English speakers from UK and US for three months. The qualitative data collected from the intercultural communication project includes pre-survey questionnaire, email entries, e-journals, discourse completion test, e-interview. In this particular paper, discourse analysis has been administered on a pair of participants who exchanged views on the issue of diet. The interchange between the British-born Chinese and the Taiwan girl has raised different opinions. This paper highlights the computer-mediated features alongside the participants’ linguistic choices during negotiation. The analysis shows how different views are negotiated without causing a tension and what politeness strategies are used in expressing different opinions. Although not explicitly concerned with training, it is hoped that the findings from this research will inform EFL practitioners who want to use E-learning, and specifically e-pals, to increase learners’ pragmatic knowledge and intercultural awareness.

### References:

- Bouton, Lawrence F. (1999). “Developing Nonnative Speakers Skills in Interpreting Conversational Implicatures in English.” *Culture in Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Ed. Eli Hinkel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, Penelope and Steven Levinson, (1987) *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodmacher Asako K. (1996) Teaching awareness of stereotyping. *The Internet TESL Journal* 2(8). Available at <http://iteslj.org/Lessons/Kajiura-Stereotyping.html>
- Goffman, Erving. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face interaction*. Oxford, England : Aldine.
- Hymes, Dell. (1974) *The Ethnography of Speaking*. In B. Blount (ed.) *Language, Culture and Society*. Mass.: Winthrop, Cambridge. 189-223.
- Janney, R. W., & Arndt, H. (1992). Intracultural tact versus intercultural tact. In R. J. Watts, S. Ide & K. Ehlich (Eds.), *Politeness in language* (pp. 21-41). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Pruegger, V. J., & Rogers, T. B. (1994). Cross-cultural sensitivity training: Methods and assessment. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 18, 369-387.
- Meier, A. J. (1995a). Defining politeness: Universality in appropriateness. *Language Sciences*, 17, 345-365.
- Meier, A. J. (1995b). Passages of politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 24, 381-392.
- Searle, John. R. (1969), *Speech Acts. An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge

## Intra- and Inter-cultural Politeness in Student-Professor Conversation in Japanese

HUDSON, MUTSUKO ENDO

Michigan State University, E-Mail: [endo@msu.edu](mailto:endo@msu.edu)

**Keywords:** Japanese; *keigo* ('honorifics'); politeness; student-professor conversation

*Keigo* ('honorifics') is difficult for Japanese native speakers (NSs). Many, however, consider its use inevitable or even desirable (文化庁1995-2005). This is likely related to the general belief that its successful manipulation shows 'proper' education and/or upbringing. An amazing array of academic and nonacademic books are thus available on how to use *keigo* (e.g. 井上1999; 大野・柴田1977; 金井2007; 菊地1997; 高杉2007; 辻村1992; 文化庁1986). As it pertains to self-identity, use of *keigo* by nonnative speakers (NNSs) is a complicated issue. Although materials for learners do exist (e.g. Mizutani and Mizutani 1987; Niyekawa 1991; 金子2006; 草薙2006), those based on research seem rare. Whether NNSs decide to model after NS usage or not, it is beneficial for them to know how *keigo* is actually used and perceived by their NS and NNS peers in Japan.

The present study is a first step in that direction. It investigates intra- and inter-cultural politeness in Japanese by comparing conversations between an NS professor and NS students, and conversations with NNS students. Twenty chats on various topics (approximately 5 hours) were videotaped at five colleges in Japan in 2007. Thirty-four people participated--NSs: 9 undergraduates (3M, 6F), 6 graduates (3M, 3F), and 8 professors (5M, 3F); NNSs: 7 undergraduates (6M, 1F) and 4 graduates (2M, 2F). One hypothesis was that intermediate/advanced-level college students use more *keigo* than do NS peers in Japan (cf. Kasper and Blum-kulka 1993). This was supported regarding the use of 申します ('my name is') in self-introduction. It was also found that for many NS undergraduates *keigo* simply means a use of *desu/masu* form (instead of the plain form).

### References:

- Kasper, Gabriele and Blum-kulka, Shoshana (eds.). (1993). *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mizutani, Osamu and Mizutani, Nobuko. (1987). *How to be Polite in Japanese* (『日本語の敬語』). Tokyo: The Japan Times.
- Niyekawa, Agnes M. (1991). *Minimum Essential Politeness: A Guide to the Japanese Honorific Language*. Tokyo: Kodansha International.

井上史雄 (1999). 『敬語はこわくない：最新用例と基礎知識』講談社

大野 晋・柴田 武 (編) (1977) 『岩波講座日本語4：敬語』岩波書店

金井良子 (2007). 『これが正しい敬語』中経出版

金子広幸 (2006). 『にほんご敬語トレーニング』アスク出版事業部

菊地康人 (1997). 『敬語』講談社

草薙 裕 (2006). 『敬語ネイティブになろう!!』くろしお出版

高杉具伸 (編) (2007). 『その敬語ウソ、ホント?!』オデッセウス出版

辻村敏樹 (1992). 『敬語論考』明治書院

文化庁 (編) (1986). 『「ことば」シリーズ24：続敬語』大蔵省印刷局

文化庁 (1995-2005). 「国語に関する世論調査」

<http://www.bunka.go.jp/1kokugo/frame.asp%7B0fl=list&id=1000001687&clc=1000000073%7B9.html>

## Beyond the Western Horizon – Brown and Levinson's Theory Revisited

INAGAKI, NORIKO

Kings College London / Birkbeck College; E-Mail: [ni2@soas.ac.uk](mailto:ni2@soas.ac.uk)

**Keywords:** politeness; modernism; rational choice theory; individualism and collectivism

Brown & Levinson's (B&L's) politeness theory is built upon the twin assumptions of 'rationality' and 'face', which are personified in a so-called universal Model Person (MP). B&L's (1987:244) *a priori* universal claims are:

- (i) The universality of face, describable as two kinds of wants
- (ii) The potential universality of rational action devoted to satisfy others' face wants.
- (iii) The universality of the mutual knowledge between interactants of (i) and (ii)

B&L argue that the seriousness of a Face Threatening Act (FTA) is measured as a complex function of three variables ('power', 'distance' and 'ranking of imposition'). They claim that the MP *rationally* measures these variables, and chooses those strategies which give the highest pay-offs to the individual so that the potential face damage of FTAs may be minimised. B&L define this strategic action of the MP as 'politeness' in their theory.

Major criticisms of B&L's most popular politeness theory are raised mainly by non-Anglo-Saxon researchers (e.g. Ide 1989, Matsumoto 1988, Gu 1990, Mao 1994, Nwoye 1992) pointing out the assumptions of Western individualism lying behind B&L's MP. They point out that in the name of this allegedly 'rational' 'universal' Model Person, an individualistic Western model of self has been assumed. Why is their criticism significant? Because MP's strategic action of politeness in B&L's theory could end up being interpreted as 'impolite' behaviour in a collectivist society! The self in collectivistic societies sees himself/herself as part of one or more collectives (family, co-workers, tribes, nation) and emphasises connectedness to other members and is expected to give priority to the goals of these collectives rather than to his/her own personal goals. To be 'polite' in these societies is to maintain harmony with others and not to seek one's own goals. It is directly opposite to the MP's insistence on satisfying his own individual wants or rationally calculating the highest pay-offs as in B&L's theory. From the perspective of a person from collectivistic societies, the MP's calculative strategic actions aiming for the highest pay-offs are far from being polite, but rather may be regarded as self-seeking and thoroughly impolite behaviour! Researchers from collectivistic societies find it impossible to understand how such self-seeking, calculative strategic actions aiming for the highest pay-offs can be an adequate explanation of true politeness. A different depiction of self leads to a totally different perception of what constitutes genuine politeness. Interestingly, in many disciplines since the 1980s there have been similar criticisms that the individualistic conception of personhood has been blandly assumed in much Western universal rationalist theory construction. (e.g. Hofstede 1980; Markus and Kitayama 1991; Spiro 1993; Rosaldo 1984)

For those who come from a collectivistic culture, which insists on the fundamental relatedness of individuals to one another and harmonious interdependence with them, the Western individualistic self, which make rational calculations and free decisions, does not adequately represent the psychological tension which they experience everyday in their society. However, the Model Person in B&L's theory should not be criticised merely as Western ethnocentrism, because the MP was simply meant to be a theoretical model and it was not intended to carry any particular psychological property or cultural trait. I contend that the Model Person in B&L's theory can be traced to a 'modernity's self', presupposed in *modernist* theory construction. It is assumed that the modernity's self is 'rational', 'autonomous' and 'universal' and is able to know the world 'objectively' with 'rationality'. It is also depicted as *homo economicus* (economical man), a calculating satisfier of its own desires seeking to produce the greatest pay-off. This modernity's self is used widely in various modern theories including B&L's theory. In fact, the term 'rationality', a buzzword in *modernist* thinking, is used in the definition of the MP. B&L's explanation of 'payoffs' associated with each of the politeness strategies characterises the rational *homo economicus*. Indeed, B&L explicitly declare that they adopt the Weberian *zweckrational* model of individual action rather than a *wertrational* model (1987:62). In this paper, I contend that B&L's MP represents a typical modernity model of self, which is 'autonomous' 'calculative' and 'goal-oriented' as in 'rational choice theory'. From this point of view, criticism of the B&L model of self should go further than pointing simply to its western bias. More fundamentally, B&L's model of self is tied into their procedures for modernist theory construction, which have a substantial pedigree in much of modern science.

## Cultural Variability in Face Interpretation and Management

JAKUBOWSKA, EWA

University of Silesia; E-Mail: [ewajakub@wp.pl](mailto:ewajakub@wp.pl)

Face is a socio-cultural construct. It is created by the participation of others during social interaction. It is a complex entity shaped in terms of social values (Lim, 1994: 210; Goffman, 1967; Chu, 1985; Brown and Levinson, 1987). Goffman (1967:5) defines face as "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself" and "an image of self delineated in terms of approved social attributes." In other words, face is a complex image of self which is socially constructed and determined by a system of cultural values.

Thus, although public self-image (face) and the social necessity to orient oneself to it in interaction are universal, the former has also culture-specific constituents. The basic, universal desire inherent in human nature "for a 'good' face" earns different interpretations in different cultures, because the constituents of 'good' are culturally determined (O'Driscoll, 1996: 4); so there are differences in the content of face (Mao, 1994; Matsumoto, 1988). Moral rules, hierarchies of values and social organisation are specific to particular cultures; as a consequence the image of self created on their basis must also differ across cultures.

The aim of the paper is to present an alternative model of face, trying to explain the cultural variability both in its interpretation and management. According to the model, face is a multi-faceted construct which can be analysed at many interrelated levels.

The second part of the paper will be devoted to testing the applicability of the model of face to two cultures, Polish (collectivistic culture) and Anglo-American (individualistic culture). The fact that these two cultures differ significantly along the dimension of individualism-collectivism is one of the main reasons for choosing these cultures. Another one is almost complete inexistence of the concept of face in Polish academic texts. While face in Anglo-American culture has been thoroughly described by sociologists, social psychologists and linguists, the concept of face in Polish culture has not aroused much interest among researchers, Polish researchers included.

The data used in the research come from participant observation, introspection and written sources.

### References:

- Brown, P., Levinson, S.C. (1987). *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chu, G.C. (1985) "The changing concept of self in contemporary China". In: A.J. Marsella, G. DeVos and F.L.K. Hsu (eds.), *Culture and Self. Asian and Western Perspectives*. New York, London: Tavistock Publications.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essays in Face-to-Face Behavior*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Lim, T.-S. (1994): "Facework and interpersonal relationships". In: S. Ting-Toomey (ed.), *The Challenge of Facework*. Albany: State University of New York Press (209-230)
- Mao, L.R. (1994): "Beyond politeness theory: "Face" revisited and renewed". In: *Journal of Pragmatics*, 21
- Markus, H., Kitayama, S. (1991) "Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation". In: *Psychological Review*, 98 (224-253)
- Matsumoto, Y. (1988). "Reexamination of the universality of face: politeness phenomena in Japanese". In: *Journal of Pragmatics*, 12 (403-426).
- O'Driscoll, J. (1996) "About face: A defence and elaboration of universal dualism". In: *Journal of Pragmatics* 25 (1-32).

***In curteisie was set ful muchel hir lest*: Politeness and Impoliteness in Chaucer's Canterbury Tales**

JUCKER, ANDREAS H.

University of Zurich; E-Mail: [ahjucker@es.uzh.ch](mailto:ahjucker@es.uzh.ch)

Geoffrey Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, written at the end of the fourteenth century, offer a rich array of tales and characters with numerous conversations both in the individual tales and in the narrative frame depicting a group of pilgrims travelling to Canterbury. The characters come from all walks of medieval life in England, and the conversations are as varied as the characters, ranging from the civil and polite to the impolite and downright rude. They are, therefore, the ideal testing ground for the application of politeness theory to historical data.

Chaucer has often been praised for the realism of his narrative descriptions. However, no claims are made here that Chaucer's depiction of characters and their language is in any way directly representative of the actual language use in late fourteenth-century England. The richness of Chaucer's fictional world deserves a pragmatic analysis in its own right.

Earlier politeness-related research on Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* has focused on address terms (Mazzon 2000; Honegger 2003; Jucker 2006) and on speech acts such as promises (e.g. Arnovick 1994) and insults (e.g. Jucker 2000). In this paper I would like to draw on these previous descriptions and combine them into a larger picture of politeness and impoliteness in Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*.

From a larger perspective, the *Canterbury Tales* can be seen as the dawn of English politeness culture. Kohnen (2008) has shown that on the basis of his evidence, politeness in the sense of face work does not seem to have played a significant role in Anglo-Saxon England. By the time of Geoffrey Chaucer, French has had a major influence on English. One clear reflection of this is the use two pronouns of address, *thou* and *ye* for single addressees. In Anglo-Saxon England kin loyalty and mutual obligation as well as the Christian values of *humilitas* and *caritas* were of prime importance. In Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, under the influence of French, it is the term *curteisie* 'courtliness, good manners, courtesy as a moral ideal' which takes centre stage and which opens the way for the English politeness culture that we know today.

(Title quote: 'Her greatest pleasure was in good manners' *The Riverside Chaucer*, I.132)

**References:**

- Arnovick, Leslie K. (1994) Dorigen's promise and scholars' premise: The orality of the speech acts in the Franklin's Tale. In: Mark C. Amodio (ed.). *Oral Poetics in Middle English Poetry*. New York: Garland.
- Honegger, Thomas. (2003) "And if ye wol nat so, my lady sweete, thanne preye I thee, [...]": Forms of address in Chaucer's Knight's Tale. In: Irma Taavitsainen and Andreas H. Jucker (eds.). *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 61-84.
- Jucker, Andreas H. (2000) Slanders, slurs and insults on the road to Canterbury. Forms of verbal aggression in Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*. In: Taavitsainen, Irma, Terttu Nevalainen, Päivi Pahta and Matti Rissanen (eds.). *Placing Middle English in Context*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 369-389.
- Jucker, Andreas H. (2006) "Thou art so loothly and so oold also": The use of *ye* and *thou* in Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*. *Anglistik* 17.2, 57-72.
- Kohnen, Thomas. (2008) Linguistic politeness in Anglo-Saxon England? A study of Old English address terms. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 9.1, 140-158.
- Mazzon, Gabriella. (2000) Social relations and form of address in the *Canterbury Tales*. In: Dieter Kastovsky and Arthur Mettinger (eds.). *The History of English in a Social Context. A Contribution to Historical Sociolinguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 135-168.



## A Situated Model of the Historical Chinese Deferential Denigration/Elevation Phenomenon

KÁDÁR, DÁNIEL Z.

Research Institute for Linguistics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences; E-Mail: [danielkadar@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:danielkadar@yahoo.co.uk)

**Keywords:** denigration/elevation; Chinese; deference; historical pragmatics; letter writing

The aim of this study is to inquire into the features of the historical Chinese phenomenon of self-denigration and addressee-elevation.

The pragmatic examination of the modern Chinese polite elevation/denigration (henceforth E/D) phenomenon began with Gu Yueguo's (1990) renowned paper and it has been studied by both East Asian experts (e.g. Ide 1989) and Western theorists (cf. Eelen 2001). Furthermore, historical Chinese E/D has been thoroughly examined by Peng (1998, 2000) and Kádár (2005, 2007). Examining E/D in a historical context has particular significance because in traditional Chinese, E/D had a much more elaborate system, and an incomparably larger lexicon, than E/D in modern China. However, in spite of its relatively long research history, the interactional working of E/D has not yet been mapped in-depth: scholars tend to take it for granted that E/D is realised through a vast inventory of honorifics and certain socially negotiated forms of linguistic behaviour.

The present study explores the linguistic means by which the inhabitants of old China elevated their addressees and denigrated themselves. As becomes evident from the analysis, E/D is arguably more complex than it is suggested by the technical literature:

- Firstly, although it is often claimed that in old China E/D was basically realised through an extensive honorific lexicon and certain forms of prescribed deferential behaviour (see Kádár 2007), in fact, as illustrated by several historical examples, E/D could be practised by a more varied set of linguistic tools. These tools include, amongst others, proverbs, allusions, literary citations, onomatopoeic words, as well as seemingly 'neutral' expressions that gain E/D connotation in a given situated context. For instance, proverbs, such as *bi-xue-furen* 婢學夫人 ('the servant girl learns to behave in a ladylike manner'), could become addressee-elevating and self-denigrating expressions in certain historical contexts, and in certain interpersonal relationships, even if in other contexts they did not fulfil such function.
- Secondly, the E/D phenomenon could be practiced through forms of varied lexical meaning, including expressions of *linguistic rudeness, humour, and emotions*. For instance, utterances such as "Sir, I wonder whether you have a depraved taste?" (*Qi zuxia you shijia-zhi-pi yu* 豈足下有嗜痂之癖歟) could be utilised to deferentially refuse the addressee's appraisal and thus denigrate oneself. This, similarly to the previous point, illustrates that the E/D phenomenon was often realised in situated contexts.
- Thirdly, the textual analysis of the studied corpus illustrates that E/D was often realised in historical Chinese communication beyond word and sentence units. For instance, writers of historical Chinese letters often utilised long parables in order to convey the message of E/D to the addressee. In such instances E/D could be simultaneously practiced on a 'surface' lexical and a 'deeper' discourse level. This, again, illustrates that E/D could become a situated interactional phenomenon.

This study, relying on the analysis of the aforementioned points, argues that historical Chinese deferential – elevating and denigrating – communication provided a more complex linguistic inventory than the application of the extensive historical Chinese E/D lexicon and socially predetermined behavioural norms discussed by previous studies. In fact, this is in line with the claim that the E/D phenomenon had particular significance in historical Chinese communication. In order to be able to capture the historical Chinese E/D phenomenon in its full complexity, it has to be studied in particular interactions as a situated phenomenon, or, in other words, a situated model is needed to capture several aspects of the E/D.

In order to be able to examine E/D as a situated phenomenon, the present work adopts the so-called *pragmaphilological* approach to study a historical corpus, that is, it focuses on the "contextual aspects of historical texts" (see Jacobs and Jucker 1995: 11). The present study examines a corpus of sixty letters, drawn from the famous Qing dynasty (1644–1911) collection of historical Chinese private letters, *Letters From Snow Swan Retreat* (*Xuehong-xuan chidu* 雪鴻軒尺牘), written by Gong Weizhai 龔未齋 (1738–1811). This corpus, which has also been translated to English (see Kádár 2008), contains letters that belong to fifteen different subgenres (such as, letters of celebrations and letters accompanying gifts; each subgenre is represented by four letters); this generic variedness makes this corpus suitable for the study of the situated aspect of the E/D phenomenon. It should be noted that private letters, written in Classical Chinese (*wenyan* 文言), were chosen in general because they are particularly apt to reconstruct historical language use (see Nevelainen 2007). Furthermore, in historical Chinese letter writing, which served the practical goal of interpersonal communication, the E/D phenomenon played a more important role than in other, more literary genres.

## The Pragmatics of Forgiveness: Judgments of Apologies in the Israeli Political Arena

KAMPF, ZOHAR

UCLA Center for Language, Interaction & Culture; E-Mail: [Zohar29@zahav.net.il](mailto:Zohar29@zahav.net.il)

**Keywords:** forgiveness; apology; political discourse; political face; interpretive community

Although the theme of forgiveness has been studied extensively in various fields of humanities and social science (Diegeser, 2001; Govier, 2002), it has thus far been neglected by discourse scholars. Drawing on data from the Israeli political discourse between 1997-2004, this paper analyzes the ways in which apologies are interpreted and judged by political actors as members of a distinctive interpretive community (Fish, 1980) and the extent to which they are accepted or rejected. The findings show that although realized infelicitously, most of the apologies made by Israeli political figures were accepted by the offended parties or their representatives. One explanation for this finding is that the traditional felicity conditions is replaced in the political arena by the 'embarrassment condition', that is, the extent to which the gesture is perceived by the forgiver as threatening the apologizer's political face. The political actors' awareness of the importance of symbolic power in the political arena leads to a more appreciative and positive attitude toward the self face threatening gesture as well as to a greater willingness to accept the apology. Other reasons to forgive are less dependent on the judgment of the linguistic performance than on the various interests on the part of the forgiver. In cases in which the interest of the offended party is to detract from the symbolic power of his/her rival, even a full and humble apology may be refused. Inversely, even an incomplete form may be accepted if the offended is motivated to forgive. These findings are in line with Mills' (2003) argument regarding the total dependency of the apology on the way in which it is judged by its recipient.

### References:

- Digester, P. E. (2001). *Political Forgiveness*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.  
Fish, S. (1980). *Is There a Text in This Class?* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.  
Govier, T. (2002). *Forgiveness and Revenge*. New York: Routledge.  
Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---

## Politeness Strategies in Requests in Service Encounters in Malaysia

KAUR, BALJIT

University of Auckland; E-Mail: [bsur002@ec.auckland.ac.nz](mailto:bsur002@ec.auckland.ac.nz)

**Keywords:** politeness; requests; service encounters

This study investigates the politeness strategies used in the realization of requests in a Malaysian service encounter context and the factors involved in the choice of these politeness strategies. The data is taken from naturally occurring service encounters in two service centres in a single type of setting, ie. service encounters between customers and service Act providers in a telecommunications organization. The subjects speak ME and/or BM. The data analysis is based on three main levels of directness in polite requests (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989): the first level is Direct Level, the second level is Conventionally Indirect and the third level is Non-Conventionally Indirect. The Cross-Cultural Speech Realisation Project (CCSARP) (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper, eds, 1989) forms the framework of analysis of these interactions in this study. The analysis will also take into account internal and external modifications.

The use of indirectness is an important aspect of Malay community life because one of its main intentions is conflict avoidance Asmah (1992). However the data shows that Malaysian speakers have a preference of using direct strategies when making requests in service encounters. It can also be argued that perceptions of face threats depend on the norms of service encounters, as pointed out by Bourdieu (1990) that participants in an interaction behave appropriately to the type of situation. This study shows how the different ethnic groups with different linguistic backgrounds interact in service encounters in Malaysian English (ME), Bahasa Melayu (BM) or through code-switching.

The more direct the requests the clearer is the request and this saves time on the part of the speaker. This paper aims at investigating two questions relating to politeness strategies in service encounters: (1) What politeness strategies are displayed by Malaysians when making requests in service encounters in Malaysia? (2) Do these strategies vary according to the choice of language varieties?

## Japanese Honorifics as a System of Metaphors

KIM, ALAN HYUN-OAK

Department of Linguistics, Southern Illinois University Carbondale; E-Mail: [alanhkim@siu.edu](mailto:alanhkim@siu.edu)

**Keywords:** politeness; honorifics; metaphor; principle; grammaticalization

1. Along the line of Kim (2004), I argue in this paper that the Japanese honorific system may be accounted for by two fundamental factors: (i) a single premise, which a native speaker of Japanese assumes to hold about the notion of their superiors in honorifics, and (ii) a set of principles which may be induced from such a premise. They are as follows:

- (1) Superior is sacred and is the source of power over, and benevolence for, Subordinate. i.e. Superior is a taboo object.
- (2) Four principles induced from (1):
  - a. Superior is to be segregated. (Principle of Taboo)
  - b. Superior is free from labor. (Principle of Labor)
  - c. Superior is found above the level of Subordinate. (Principle of Location)
  - d. Superior alone commands and bestows benevolence. (Principle of Authority)

Superior is a model person in honorifics. Metaphorically, Superior is kept separated from the rest of the community. Secular contamination is avoided by cleansing, and wrapping is one of such cleansing rituals. Violations of taboo will result in consequences fatal to the well-being of Subordinate and its community. Superior is waived labor, while Subordinate serves Superior by maximizing labor. Topologically speaking, Superior occupies a higher location with respect to Subordinate's place. Subordinate's movements directed toward Superior is upward by definition, and the reverse is true when Superior is a provider. Note that, from the premise (1), no movement is possible for Superior. Metaphorically, however, Superior's movement may be interpreted as "emergence (with no involvement of efforts on the part of Superior)", which complies with Principle (2b). Superior is a commander/benefactor/creditor, whom Subordinate is subservient to and dependent on. Subordinate cannot give a favor to Superior, but Subordinate petitions bestowing such a favor to Superior.

2. The following exemplifies what our hypothesis can predict and account for:

- Wrapping is a manifestation of cleansing rituals in compliance with the taboo principle (2a). A noun is metaphorically "wrapped" with the honorific prefixes [*o-* and *go-*]. E.g. *o-[kotoba]* (your honorable remarks); *go-toozyoo* (your honorable boarding to a vehicle such as an airplane.) As in [*yuki-ga furi*]-***masu*** (I cordially inform you [that it snows]), the proposition message in the square-brackets [*yuki-ga furi*] is metaphorically 'wrapped' for presenting it to Superior, where the polite auxiliary verb *masu*, is seen as a wrapper in the 'gift-wrapping' metaphor.
- Notwithstanding the labor-waiving principle (2b), Superior's actions and movements are, needless to say, inevitable in reality. Grammar must reconcile such a contradiction between principle and reality, and so it does in an extremely intriguing way. Namely, Superior's action is taken as an event of 'emergence (appearing by itself)' and metaphorized by making use of inchoative devices such as mechanisms of passive, (*r*)*are*, and inchoation, [*x*]-*ni naru* (it becomes [*x*]), where *x* is predicate verb. E.g. via passivization, *Sensei-ga sinbun-o yom-areru-u* (Professor reads (in the passivized form) a newspaper) or via inchoation, *Sensei-ga sinbun-o o-yomi-ni na-ru* (= Professor turns into a state of honorable reading a newspaper.) The locative marker *x-ni-okaserareteha* (at the honorable place *x*) functions as the honorific subject case marker for Superior. E.g. *Heika-ni-okaserareteha S-byoo-in-wo go-hoomon-sare-ta* (A visit with S-hospital took place at His Majesty's locus) Heika's action is converted to an expression of the person's appearance at that particular spot, (i.e. its own place), which complies with the principle of (2b).
- According to (2b), Subordinate must maximize its service for Superior. Thus, Subordinate, in contrast to Superior's queen-bee-like immobility, must 'work' or 'devote itself to take care all the need for Superior: the predicate is to be a transitive verb or auxiliary. In fact it is precisely the case that such a predicate takes the humiliating honorific formula *o-V-suru*, with an auxiliary *suru* originally 'do' or 'execute.' E.g. *Watashi-ga sensei-o o-mati-suru* (I carry on my sincere action of waiting for Professor.)
- As for (2c), Subordinate's action is topologically upward as in *sasiager-u* 'submit,' while that of Superior is downward *kudasar-u* 'grant', 'award.'
- While issuing an order to Superior is impossible as per (2d), Subordinate can receive what is requested as a blessing from Superior's graceful compliance. *Watashi-ga sensei-ni tegami-wo yon-de sasiageru* (I submit/bestow my sincere reading of the letter to Superior), or *Sensei-no zisyo-o tukawasete itadaku* (I receive a favor of Professor for letting me use his dictionary), where one finds Subordinate's power concession in favor of Superior.

3. The present metaphor-based analysis sheds light on questions on how the grammatical formulae are involved in morphemic as well phrasal constructs in rigorously distinct way, namely, passive and inchoative for Respective Honorifics, in contrast, the agentive pro-verb 'do' exclusively with Humiliative Honorifics. The proposed hypothesis provides a principled explanation for the restricted occurrence of politeness morphemes peripherally at the final position of a discourse utterance, which exhibits qualitative differences from the other formulae in the honorific grammar of Japanese.

**Power and Solidarity Revisited:  
The Ramifications of Tripartite Address in Golden Age Spanish**

KING, JEREMY

Louisiana State University; E-Mail: [jking@lsu.edu](mailto:jking@lsu.edu)

The address system of Spanish has evolved and developed significantly over the past millennium, and most productively during the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries. This period, known as the Golden Age (GA), witnessed numerous significant changes to a number of pronominal address forms, the effects of which can still be seen in modern dialects of the language. The consideration of the strategies for the selection of address pronouns that evince varying levels of deference and formality in GA Spanish constitutes an issue that holds the potential to explain much of the upheaval of the language's address system, yet the academic literature attests to the dearth of critical studies on this issue.

One of the most salient sociolinguistic facts that has been noted regarding the GA is the realization on the part of Spain's citizens that, due to the restructuring of their society, the personal pronouns *tu* and *vos* that had been used to express and define interpersonal relationships since the Roman Empire were no longer effective for communicating specific social cues, particularly distinct levels of formality and social distance. Philological analysts generally agree about the pragmalinguistic ramifications of the address system of the GA: *tu* was used with an interlocutor with whom one held great confidence and intimacy; *Vuestra Merced* was used in situations requiring high levels of formality; and *vos* was used to speak to those of much lower social status than oneself, such as servants and children (Castillo Mathieu 1982; de Luna 1619; Lapesa 1981). Although this description and classification of GA pronominal address forms has met with increased criticism in diachronic studies (King 2006; Moreno 2002; St. Clair Sloan 1922), the very existence of this tripartite pronominal address system casts doubt on existing theoretical models of interpersonal address and politeness patterns in European languages.

Brown and Gilman's (1960) theoretical framework constitutes the first, and most frequently cited, attempt to categorize patterns of pronominal address. Their approach argues that the bipartite formal (*V* pronoun) / informal (*T* pronoun) address systems characteristic of European languages share common patterns of usage. The authors also assert that speakers of these languages establish social patterns of address with interlocutors based on two dimensions: *power* and *solidarity*. Thus, the form(s) of pronominal address one chooses in conversation is hypothesized to be based on one's perception of the presence of either a power differential or shared characteristics with one's interlocutor. According to Brown and Gilman, the *power* semantic dominated in all of Europe until well into the nineteenth century, and thus non-reciprocal *T-V* address patterns (as opposed to reciprocal *T-T* or *V-V* patterns) were the norm cross-linguistically. Brown and Gilman's discussion of pronominal address formed the basis for a significant subset of strategies of explanation for the expression of *negative politeness* in the model of Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987); the class of so-called *V* pronouns, in particular, are exemplified as a type of referent honorific which serves to show deference to one's interlocutor (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 180).

My research purpose in this paper is threefold: First, I consider the societal and interpersonal circumstances in which the three primary forms of pronominal address were used in 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century Spanish through an in-depth analysis of two genres of literary primary sources, the *comedia* and the *entremés*. In particular, I focus on the popular claim that the *vos* of the GA served to express contempt or disdain for one's interlocutor (Castillo Mathieu 1982; Lapesa 1981; Monreal 1878). Second, I take issue with the implication that the GA *V* form *Vuestra Merced* represents an honorific; I argue that the use of this form more closely resembles a type of *politic behavior* (Watts 2003, 2005) intended to maintain balance in interpersonal social relationships rather than to strictly show deference. Finally, I examine the power and solidarity model of Brown and Gilman (1960) and argue that their framework can account for neither the tripartite address system characteristic of GA Spanish, nor the systems present in several modern dialects of the language. I conclude by suggesting a new theoretical framework that will reconcile the traditional bipartite model with existing tripartite systems. This framework will make specific reference to the notion of *public façade* (King 2006), specifically, that in dramatic texts, the social sphere tends to serve as a catalyst for more formal registers of speech than are typically utilized in private settings, even among the same interlocutors. Additionally, I address the seldom-discussed issue of *neutral* address forms (Moreno 2002; St. Clair Sloan 1922), which is a key concept to a precise understanding of GA Spanish address patterns.

This study represents a crucial phase in the reformulation of models of interpersonal address and has theoretical implications for various aspects of politeness theories, particularly the status of address pronouns in diachronic investigations of linguistic politeness.

## **Politeness in Email Letters of Application**

KRANJC, SIMONA

NIDORFER ŠIŠKOVIČ, MOJCA

Department of Slovene Studies, Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana

E-Mail: [simona.kranjc@ff.uni-lj.si](mailto:simona.kranjc@ff.uni-lj.si); [mojca.nidorfer@ff.uni-lj.si](mailto:mojca.nidorfer@ff.uni-lj.si)

**Keywords:** politeness; email; electronic communication; business writing; requests

Politeness is a phenomenon that should be always examined in regard to the situation, taking into consideration the context in which communication occurs. The article researches politeness in electronic communication, i. e. in formal email letters written by non-Slovene learners of Slovene language from ten European countries – to win a grant for a summer language seminar.

The use of emails in computer mediated communication has shifted the communication strategies used by the writers according to the media, as has been confirmed in all the analyses (Baron, 1998, 2002; Crystal, 2001; Gains, 1999; Gimenez, 2000; Mallon in Oppenheim, 2002; Rice, 1997), towards more informal writing, and with a lot of elements that are typical of a spoken communication and oral discourse. Electronic communication has been spread to all of people's personal and business communication, and it is also becoming more and more the tool to get the work done more efficiently, regarding its advantages, i. e. speed, price, usability, and virtual closeness in contacts around the world. Moreover, the use of electronic cross-cultural communication is shifting the meaning of the socially different etiquette in communication, diminishing the differences among cultures and societies, specifically in business communication.

This study examines a corpus of 30 email letters sent by learners of the Slovene language in which they applied for a grant to participate at a two-week Seminar on the Slovene language, literature and culture held every summer at the University of Ljubljana. All the writers are students of Slovene as a foreign language at various universities in more than ten different European countries, therefore they wrote their applications in Slovene. The analysis focuses on the communication strategies, especially the use of politeness strategies and their linguistic realizations in the emails. The illocutionary act of request as the face-threatening act is examined according to the politeness theory from Brown and Levinson (1987), but taken revised (Bargiela-Chiappini, 2002; Pilegaard, 1997) with a broader aspect of analyzing the politeness strategies on a macro- as well as micro-level in the examined texts. Since the formal letters of requests (here letters of application) have quite a rigid form and structure of moves, as well as many typical expressions, we were interested in comparative analysis of the email business letters with the letters written on paper and sent by 'snail mail' or fax. We took a closer look into the arguments used in the supportive acts of the requests as well as the modifiers. The comparison of email letters from the corpus showed that sometimes an application is written in the body of the email, however, in some others the application was added as attachment, and only a message about it was in the body of the email. In the first group mentioned, the writers tend to preserve the official form of the application letter with all the elements, such as addresses added, and also the formal structure with paragraphs.

The interactional goal of the writers in the corpus was to win a grant to come to Ljubljana to a summer seminar and improve their knowledge of the Slovene language. It is worth mentioning that it is difficult to win the grant for students in the first years of their university studies. They have usually not started their studies and translations into and from Slovene, they do not do research, therefore, some of them enclosed letters of recommendation from their teachers in attachments.

The specific demographic feature of the writers of the emails examined is that the emails were written by students, so the age of the writers was around twenty. Therefore, it should be taken into consideration that they belong to a generation of the electronic communication who use more or less all the varieties of the computer mediated communication every day. On the other hand, they had practically no education on the email writing, since this topic is barely incorporated in the modern textbooks, even less in the textbooks for the learners of foreign languages. Moreover, these students also belong to a population that has very little or no experience in writing business letters, since they, being university students, usually do not work and interact in business. They wrote and sent the application letters through the nowadays most common mediator, electronic communication, to the official committee of university teachers at a foreign university. Regarding all of these, the situation is very formal, social distance between senders and receivers is high, and also the imposition degree of their requests is high.

The analysis is focused on the variations of direct and indirect strategies of expressing requests and the use of linguistic expressions that would show different culturally specific uses of language in cross-cultural interaction.

## Verbal Duelling in Ancient Roman Comedy

KRYLOVÁ, BARBORA

Charles University, Prague; E-mail: [krylovab@dec59.ruk.cuni.cz](mailto:krylovab@dec59.ruk.cuni.cz)

The aim of the proposed paper is to examine the spectrum of socio-communicative functions of verbal duelling in ancient Roman comedy (Plautus, Terentius) in terms of relational work.

Since the seminal work of Labov (1972 a, b) on New York black teenagers' 'sounding', similar communicative behaviour consisting of mutual insults, which are apparently untrue or at least strongly exaggerated, was observed and described by many other scholars dealing with many other societies. Usually, verbal duelling follows a certain set of 'rules' and is often considerably formalised, which may even render highly sophisticated systems of 'ritual insults' (Labov 1972 a, b, Kochman 1983, Dundes et al. 1972) etc. As demonstrated by Labov, such communicative behaviour is prototypically employed in order to create a relaxed atmosphere, to reaffirm close relationships or to enhance group solidarity. However, some scholars (e.g. Kochman, 1983) indicated that besides ritual insults, personal insults as well may function as part of the verbal duelling game.

The paper will try to demonstrate that friendly cooperative banter is only one margin of a much broader spectrum of possible uses of verbal duelling, which may be utilised also for quite a wide range of other functions, some of them amounting to a seriously aggressive behaviour. In accordance with many recent works on (im)politeness (e.g. Culpeper 2003, Locher 2005) I will argue that also this specific language behaviour pattern of witty verbal duelling cannot be considered to be inherently polite or impolite, cooperative or aggressive, but that its interpretation always ultimately depends on expectations of the interlocutors as well as on the sets of social norms they have adopted.

In the first part of the proposed paper, I will give a brief description of the use of verbal duelling in ancient Roman comedy as well as of its 'rules' and its connection with some real-life language behaviour patterns attested for ancient Rome (*versus Fescennini*). In Roman comedy, verbal duelling is one of typical and highly frequent linguistic behaviour types of the personae. The interlocutors engaged in it try to adequately counter – or even better to 'overtrump' – the previous contribution of their communicative partner with a sharp repartee, which reinterprets the previous turn in a witty and unexpected way, so that it 'hits' the communicative partner in return. Quite often, the repartee even forms close structural parallel to the original utterance. Such language behaviour is especially characteristic of slaves (sometimes used a 'weapon' against other people). This is for the one thing in keeping with the observation that verbal duelling often belongs to the behaviour patterns of marginal or marginalised groups such as young males, black people etc., for another with the fact that a typical slave of Roman comedy is talkative, witty, cunning and quite disrespectful; often, it is a slave who organises and supervises all trickery and intrigues.

The second part of the paper will provide an overview of possible socio-communicative functions and uses of verbal duelling as well as an analysis of individual factors, which may influence the expectations and social norms of the interlocutors, which in turn determine the relational work impact of verbal duelling. In particular, following factors will be taken into account (i) relation between the interlocutors (ii) whether both/all interlocutors are willing and able to engage in verbal duelling (iii) whether they both/all are members of a social group verbal duelling is especially characteristic of (i.e. how much they are likely to assess it generally positively and whether they are likely to be used to it) (iv) whether they have the same or at least comparable experience and background knowledge shaping their expectations.

Special attention will be paid to the role of power relations between the interlocutors and the way verbal duelling might be utilised to gain or redistribute power. The material taken from Latin comedy allows quite an easy assessment of the relative power of the communicators as well as of its changes – in the fictional world of Latin comedy the characters usually behave rather as typical representatives of their prototypical social roles (such as slave, young master, his father, pimp etc.) than as realistic personae. This underlying, socially determined source of the power of comic personae ('latent network' Watts, 2003) can safely be regarded easily accessible to all recipients of a comedy, including its modern interpreters. In addition to this, the power relations of the personae of course may – and in fact do – change in course of their socio-communicative interaction ('emergent network', Watts 2003), which the recipients are able to follow in its entirety.

As verbal duelling is intrinsically a discourse phenomenon, it will be analysed – and exemplified – on extended dialogues. Its relational work properties and impacts will be assessed on the basis of both local and global heuristic clues, such as (i) responses to particular turns (ii) explicit metacommunicative comments evaluating behaviour either of the communicative partner or of the speaker himself, and (iii) general development of the interaction.

## First Person Pronouns and Politeness in Confucius' *Analects*

LEE, CHER LENG

National University of Singapore, Singapore; E-mail: [chsleec@nus.edu.sg](mailto:chsleec@nus.edu.sg)

**Keywords:** *Analects*; first person pronouns; politeness; Chinese

This paper aims to solve the mystery of the existence of four first person pronouns in the classical Chinese text of Confucius' *Analects* (300BC). Chinese grammarians have only been able to show which pronoun takes the place of subject, object, or possessive case. They could never explain why pronouns that have similar grammatical functions with one another. I believe the answer lies in pragmatics, and in particular, politeness.

It is widely accepted that in many languages, choices within the system of pronouns of address are associated with the perceived roles of the speaker and hearer as they locate themselves on continuums of status and solidarity as seen in the *tu vous* pronouns in French. In societies with clear hierarchical status, the address systems will reflect politeness in relating to each other even more clearly. In Ehlich's (1992:86) discussion of politeness in the Ancient Israel, he cites examples of master-slave relationship. In this relationship, *cābād* 'slave' and *ʔadonī* 'master', represents the most refined pair used as a "candidate" for a "polite" form of address. The different ways in which this form of address is used "have their common counterpart in the deprecating reference to oneself as a slave" (Köhler 1922:39). We find similarities in such relationships depicted in Cao Xueqin's *Dream of the Red Chamber* in Lee (1999). It would be interesting to study the interactions between Jesus and his disciples as they address him as 'Lord', 'master', and 'rabbi'. This relationship between Jesus and his disciples would make a good comparison with Confucius and his students, except that in Jesus' relationship with his disciples, there is also the issue deity involved.

Like Ancient Israel, Chinese has a rich history of 5,000 years, in which the most influential philosophy is from Confucius' *Analects*. Confucius' *Analects* is a record of conversations between Confucius and his students. In the *Analects*, knowledge is imparted from teacher to students in the form of question and answer sessions. Its importance ranges from how a government should govern its country, to family relationships with great stress in filial piety, and how a student can attain scholarship. The four different forms of first person pronouns in *Analects* are different forms used according to politeness principles governing the relationships.

There are 183 first person pronouns in the *Analects*, the distribution is as follows: 我 (25%), 吾 (62%), 予 (13%) and 朕 (0.01%).

朕 pronoun is the only pronoun whose usage has been established as a pronoun used by either the emperor or people of high status, and from the Qin dynasty onwards, it is only used by emperors. Thus, this is considered as a high pronoun used in specific domain.

予 pronoun is a polite pronoun. The speaker uses this pronoun to show a humble position. However, the humility is not in relation to the hearer but rather in relation to heaven (天), death and sickness that is out of man's control, showing reverence to matters of higher order. This is seen in example (1) where the polite pronoun is used to show humility in the discussion of 'Heaven'.

(1) 夫子矢之曰：“予所否者，天厌之！天厌之！”

The Master went to see Nan Tzu. Tzu-lu was displeased. The Master swore, "If I have done anything improper, may heaven's curse be on me, may Heaven's curse be on me!"

我 pronoun is a neutral pronoun in that it does not denote a higher nor lower status. It is usually used to teach moral issues such as filial piety and benevolence seen in example (2):

(2) 子曰：“仁远乎哉？我欲仁，斯仁至矣。”

The Master said, "Is benevolence really far away? No sooner do I desire it than it is here."

Perhaps due to its neutral status, it has the longest life-span, it is the only first person pronoun existing in today's Chinese pronoun system.

吾 pronoun is a humble pronoun in narrating the speaker's personal encounters, experiences or actions. This is the pronoun that uses the most possessive case. It is a humble pronoun that refers to self actions and things belonging to self, as in

(3) 曾子曰：“吾日三省吾身：為人謀而不忠乎？與朋友交而不信乎？傳不習乎？”

Tseng Tzu said, 'Everyday I examine myself on three counts. In what I have undertaken on another's behalf, have I failed to do my best? In my dealings with my friends have I failed to be trustworthy in what I said? Have I passed on to others anything that I have not tried out myself?

The study also shows how Confucius' pedagogy in using the different degrees of politeness in these pronouns to achieve his goals of imparting knowledge effectively.

## References:

- Brown P. and S. Levinson (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.  
Lee, C L (1999). "Mismatched pronouns in Mandarin Chinese". *Text*, 19, no. 3 : 345-370.  
Watts R., S. Ide and K. Ehlich (1992). *Politeness in Language*. Mouton de Gruyter.

**“Yeah, but...”, “sí, pero...”, “un, demo...”: Polite Disagreement Strategies in American English, Peninsular Spanish and Japanese**

LÓPEZ SAKO, NOBUO IGNACIO  
University of Granada, Spain; E-Mail: [nilsako@ugr.es](mailto:nilsako@ugr.es)

**Keywords:** disagreement; preference organization; politeness; conversation analysis; friendly conversation

It has been reported that in friendly, non-conflictive conversations people tend to agree, rather than to disagree, with other people's prior statements (Brown and Levinson 1987; Mori 1999; Pomerantz 1984; Sacks 1987) and that when interlocutors feel the need to opt for the latter, they try to show preference for the former by the use of hesitations, false starts, hedges, token agreements, and other discursive devices which indicate the dispreferred status of their utterances (Heritage 1984; Levinson 1983; Pomerantz 1984). From the perspective of linguistic politeness, these devices can be seen as strategies used by the speaker(s) to redress the potential damage disagreeing statements may cause to their interlocutor's face (Bousfield 2007; Brown and Levinson 1987; Hayashi 1996; Holtgraves 1997).

While the above pattern has been confirmed in languages other than English, such as Japanese (Mori 1999), recent studies on some so-called “Mediterranean” languages like Greek (Kakava 2002) and Hebrew (Blum-Kulka et al. 2002) have shown that the tenet of agreement as structurally preferred over disagreement is not pan-culturally sustainable. Kakava (2002) and Blum-Kulka et al. (2002) demonstrate that in these cultures disagreement that adopts a “preferred” format –i.e. straightforward and direct opposition to a prior turn in conversation– is not necessarily face-threatening and disruptive, but can be an acceptable and unsanctioned conversational style. That is, interactants are cooperative by “agreeing to disagree” (Kakava 2002: 1563).

This new evidence calls for more research to investigate cross-cultural similarities and differences regarding the relationship between linguistic politeness and its realization, and determine whether some common patterns can be discovered underneath the veil of apparent diversity. This paper aims to contribute to this area of research by comparing how American, Spanish and Japanese young people produce disagreements in friendly conversations without disrupting the harmonious interaction among them –i.e. Brown and Levinson's (1987) positive politeness; Spencer-Oatey's (2000) rapport–. The purpose is two fold: on one hand, it seeks to investigate whether the characterization made by Pomerantz (1984) for American English and by Mori (1999) for Japanese are supported by my data; additionally, it explores the Peninsular Spanish language regarding the production of disagreement in non-conflictive situations. Finally, all three data sets are contrasted to see whether an East-West distinction can be formulated.

In order to get realistic conversational data from both languages that might be amenable for contrastive analysis, conversations were elicited (Kasper 2000) in a semi-controlled setting (number and type of participants in each conversation, conversational topics, conversational setting). A total of four three-participant conversations for each language were video- and audio-recorded for transcription and analysis. The data were transcribed following the conversation analytic conventions (DuBois et al. 1992; Jefferson 2004).

Results show that all three languages share some same set of strategies for disagreeing without threatening the interlocutors' face (e.g. the often quoted “yes, but” token-agreement construction). However, important differences both in the range and type of disagreement strategies are also found. An analysis and classification of these divergent strategies show that, in some respects, Anglo-Americans are more similar to the Japanese in their behavior, but closer to the Peninsular Spanish in others. It also emerged that Japanese and Spanish share less common features, with the latter tolerating more blatant and straightforward forms of disagreement. The high tolerance of Spanish speaking interactants for open opposition suggests a conversational style similar to the other Mediterranean languages, which stand in direct contrast to Anglo-Saxon and Japanese cultures.

Drawing from the above results, it is argued that a strict East vs. West dichotomy cannot be formulated without risking over simplification. Rather, it seems more appropriate to represent the difference as a matter of scale, from more to less tolerance to straight opposition without risking being regarded as impolite. The implications of these results for a theory of linguistic (im)politeness are also discussed, the conclusion being that language, culture and context of interaction are so inextricably interrelated that it is hard to formulate a set of universal rules for polite disagreement production.



**‘Are We Really Such Different Neighbours?’:  
A Contrastive Corpus-based Analysis of Compliments in Portuguese and Spanish.**

MAIZ-AREVALO, CARMEN

Departamento de Filología Inglesa I (Universidad Complutense de Madrid); E-Mail: [cmaizare@filol.ucm.es](mailto:cmaizare@filol.ucm.es)

FREIRE FARIA, RITA

Faculty of Humanities, Portuguese Catholic University; E-Mail: [ritafreire\\_faria@hotmail.com](mailto:ritafreire_faria@hotmail.com)

**Keywords:** compliments; politeness; Spanish; Portuguese; power

Within Speech Act Theory, compliments have received a lot of attention in recent decades due to their cultural implications (for example, Wolfson & Manes 1980, Wolfson 1983 and more recently Holmes 1995, Spencer-Oatey *et al* 2000 and Sifianou 2001). Most studies have demonstrated that this speech act is culturally determined and highly formulaic (albeit some very specific cases as shown by Sifianou 2001 in her study of Greek compliments, which appear to be highly creative and indirect). Thus, what counts as a compliment for speakers of one language can be regarded by others as an embarrassing face-threatening act, which can lead to cultural bias and misunderstanding. These differences are especially obvious in the case of entirely different cultures but they can be less evident when the countries are close neighbours as it is the case with Portugal and Spain. However, even historically related countries present significant pragmatic differences. The present study aims at analysing a corpus of sixty compliments in Portuguese and Spanish with three main objectives: first, to determine what counts as a compliment in both cultures and whether there are equivalences, i.e. whether compliments in both languages tend to be formulaic or creative; secondly, to ascertain how the linguistic realisation of compliments in the two languages under study is connected to politeness, paying special attention to the variables of power and gender; finally, we aim at analysing compliment responses in Portuguese and in Spanish to determine how compliments can be differently perceived in both cultures and whether they pose a face-threatening act to the receiver or are interpreted as such.

**References:**

- Holmes, Janet (1995). What a lovely tie! Compliments and positive politeness strategies. In Janet Holmes. *Women, Men and Politeness*. London: Longman, 115 – 153
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen, Ng, Patrick and Dong, Li (2000). Responding to Compliments: British and Chinese Evaluative Judgments. In Helen Spencer-Oatey (ed.) *Culturally Speaking. Managing Rapport Through Talk Across Cultures*. London & NY: Continuum, 99 – 119
- Sifianou, Maria (2001). ‘Oh! How appropriate!’ Compliments and Politeness. In Arin Bayraktaroglu & Maria Sifianou (eds.) *Linguistic Politeness Across Boundaries – The Case of Greek and Turkish*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 391 – 430
- Wolfson, Nessa and Manes, Joan Manes (1980). The compliment as a social strategy. *Papers in Linguistics: International Journal of Human Communication* 13, 391 – 410
- Wolfson, N. (1983). An empirically based analysis of complimenting in American English. In Nessa Wolfson & Elliot Judd (eds.) *Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition*, Rowley Mass., London & Tokyo, Newbury House Publishers, 82 – 95

## **How to Get Rid of a Telemarketing Agent? Face-work Strategies in an Intercultural Service Call**

MARQUEZ REITER, ROSINA

University of Surrey; E-Mail: [rosina@marquez-reiter.freesevice.co.uk](mailto:rosina@marquez-reiter.freesevice.co.uk)

This paper discusses how face and face-work are manifested in an intercultural service call between a Uruguayan telemarketing agent and a prospective Argentinean client. The interaction analysed is a service call in which an institutional representative, from a multinational company, telephones a client for the purpose of having the client's membership renewed as it had lapsed for a relatively long period of time. The conversational participants' contributions are oriented toward the achievement of a task; namely, the institutional representative wants to obtain a sale and, the client wants to obviate any possible avenues for the former to attain her goal.

The main source of data is a recorded call between an institutional representative and a potential client. The call is part of a 200-hour service call database from a call centre. The analysis is supplemented by recorded informal interviews with institutional representatives from the call centre, including post-performance interviews with the agent who participated in the call, and field notes from (non)participant observation.

The analytical stance is sociopragmatic and makes use of concepts developed in Conversation Analysis. Specifically, manifestations of face, face-work and the incidence of metapragmatic acts are examined from a sociopragmatic perspective while the place in the overall conversation where they occur and the way in which they are co-constructed is analysed using units of analysis from Conversation Analysis.

The analysis shows that manifestations of face occurred in the opening sequence and during the unfolding of metapragmatic acts. Specifically, face was manifested as part of the conversational politeness norms for the occasion and grew out of the ongoing interaction upon marked interactional behaviour. Face also emerged as the participants tried to re-establish their conversational identities in the light of a conversational shift.

## A Solution to Some Morphosyntactic-Semantic Interface Puzzles in Japanese

MASUKO, MAYUMI

SILS, Waseda University and Computer Laboratory, Cambridge University; E-Mail: [mayumi@waseda.jp](mailto:mayumi@waseda.jp)

**Keywords:** acceptability; honorifics; morphosyntactic process; non-propositional meaning

The system of honorifics in Japanese used to be absolute in the days when the fairly rigid social hierarchy existed. As the society changed and honorifics shifted from being absolute to relative, utterances containing a predicate that incorporates multiple honorifics have begun to sound weird, if not completely acceptable. This paper attempts to explain this change.

- (1) #Tanaka-sensei-wa Sato-sensei-no gochosho-wo gohaidokunasatta.  
Tanaka-teacher-TOP Sato-teacher-GEN book[HON]-ACC read [NSH & SH]  
'Professor Tanaka read Professor Sato's book.'

(1), which was considered perfectly acceptable during the *Meiji* era, sounds rather peculiar now. This includes *haidoku*, a gerund that means 'reading' and also encodes the social rank between the referents of the two noun phrases, i.e. Professor Sato is considered to be socially higher than Professor Tanaka. Similarly, *nasaru* conveys another social rank; this suggests that the speaker of (1) considers Professor Tanaka to be higher than him/herself.

Assuming, as Kuno and Kaburaki (1977) do with their Empathy relations, social ranking is transitive, the two ranks can be collapsed as follows and this does not present any contradiction: THE SPEAKER < PROFESSOR TANAKA < PROFESSOR SATO.

Even so, (1) sounds distinctively worse than (2), which expresses roughly the same meaning:

- (2) ?Tanaka-sensei-wa Sato-sensei-no gochosho-wo  
Tanaka-teacher-TOP Sato-teacher-GEN book[HON]-ACC  
go-haidoku-ni-narareta.  
HON-reading [NSH]-DAT-did [SH]  
'Professor Tanaka read Professor Sato's book.'

*Naru*, the verb meaning 'become', began to be used in as a part of the subject-honorific complex predicate, *N-ni-naru*. *Go-haidoku*, on the other, is a non-subject-honorific gerund. The social rank expressed in (2) will be the same as that expressed by (1). And yet, there seems to be some difference in naturalness or acceptability of the two.

It might help if a different combination of 'meanings' that appears also to be banned is examined.

It is the honorific-causative as in (3):

- (3) #Tanaka sensei-wa Sato sensei-ni gochosho-wo oyomi-ni-nar-aseta.  
Prof Tanaka-TOP Prof. Sato-DAT book [HON]-ACC read [SH]-caused  
'Professor Tanaka<sub>i</sub> made Professor Sato read his<sub>j</sub> book.'

Just like (1), this does not sound perfectly natural now, though it was used in the *Meiji* era. Assuming that the social ranking conveyed by this will be the same as that of (1), it could be argued that one reason this sounds strange is because the social inferior does not usually force the superior to do anything against their wishes.

Another twist is that the same meaning can be conveyed by (4), which, even now, sounds perfectly natural:

- (4) Tanaka sensei-wa Sato sensei-ni gochosho-wo oyomase-moushiageta.  
Prof Tanaka-TOP Prof. Sato-DAT book[HON]-ACC caused to read[SH-NSH].

The predicate in (4) consists of two parts. *Oyomase*, a gerund, is non-subject-honorific and suggests that Professor Sato is socially higher than Professor Tanaka. *Moushiageru* literally means 'say' when used as the main verb and indicates that the subject is socially inferior than the non-subject, but is here used as a part of the non-subject-honorific complex predicate. The social rank is the same as all the other examples.

Compare this with the following which expresses virtually the same and is yet unacceptable:

- (5) #Sato sensei-wa Tanaka sensei-ni gochosho-wo oyomininar-are-sasenasatta.  
Prof Sato-TOP Prof. Tanaka-ACC book [HON]-ACC read [SH]-PASS-CAUSE-do [NSH].  
'Professor Sato had his book read by Professor Tanaka.' [intended]

In (5), the social relations expressed by these are the same as before. The oddness of (5). I shall argue, is due to a different factor from the source of oddness of (1) and (3).

Firstly, it should be noted here is that the social hierarchy encoded in Japanese predicates is not a purely logical relation. What is more important, or salient, is the way such a ranking is encoded: each ranking is seen from a certain viewpoint which, for the lack of a better term, I shall provisionally call the *anchor*. Put it crudely, a single predicate in modern Japanese are not allowed to encode more than two anchors. For instance, in (1), *haidoku* presents the relation seen from the referent of the subject, Professor Tanaka, whilst *nasaru* shows it from the speaker's viewpoint. Similarly, in (3) *oyomininaru* suggests Professor Tanaka is socially higher than the speaker; the anchor here is the speaker. The causative is not honorific however, and the sentence as a whole has Professor Sato as the subject, which is seen as prominent and hence should be regarded as the anchor. Likewise in (5), two different anchors are expressed: *oyomininarareru* has the speaker as the anchor while *sasenasatta* has Professor Sato as its anchor. (4), on the other hand, is fine because the two parts that are combined to form the complex predicate both encode the ranking seen from the same individual, i.e. Professor Tanaka, who acts as the anchor.

To sum up, the complex honorific predicate in modern Japanese is acceptable only when all the social relation expressed by it is presented from a singular viewpoint, i.e. with a single anchor.

## Perception and Response to Apologies: CMC in Japanese and British English

MIYAKE, KAZUKO

Oxford University (visiting professor till March 2008) / Toyo University; E-Mail: [miyake@toyonet.toyo.ac.jp](mailto:miyake@toyonet.toyo.ac.jp)

**Keywords:** politeness; apologies; mobile phone messages; interpersonal management; Japanese and British English

The purpose of this study is to investigate how interpersonal relationships are managed through the use of mobile phone in face threatening situations. A cross-cultural comparison is made of apology-response sequences between young Japanese and British in their use of the message functions of mobile phones.

The study reports on a survey of about mobile phone messages (MPMs hereafter) in Japanese and British English respectively that allow a focus on the speech act of apology. It investigates the recipients' perception of the apologies in 4 situations varying in style and personal distance. The perception here includes the recipients' evaluation of the sent messages, as well as their concerns when composing their responding messages. The linguistic features of the responding messages are also analyzed in relation to the perceptions.

The study reflects the following technical and social changes in recent years which are having a strong impact on the ways in which people communicate.

1. New communicational devices such as mobile phones and computer
2. Concepts of time and space
3. Communication style among young people

Mobile phones, particularly their message function, have become a very important tool in communication. Mobile phone communication lacks physical proximity between interactants, and MPMs lack paralinguistic and nonverbal cues. Yet these restrictions can be useful when it comes to face threatening situations (Brown and Levinson 1987) such as apologies. The writers can take time to carefully craft the expression of their messages, whereas interactants in face-to-face situations have to deal with the task of achieving their communicative purpose and relationship management on the spot.

With technological innovations and globalization, the concept of time and space in contemporary life is radically changing (Merowitz 1986). Communication is no longer dependent on physical proximity. The fact that promises and rendezvous can be arranged and changed casually is bringing about changes in attitude towards, for example, the act of being late for a meeting.

The communicational style of young Japanese now has a strong orientation towards the building-up of a feeling of comradeship and closeness, while the expression of deference is becoming less important. This trend of valuing horizontal relationships is evident in their use, with their peers, of non-polite forms of sentence ending. Mobile phone language use is a good example of this. MPMs are full of abnormal writing features that are used to promote and support a shared sense of joyful communication (Miyake 2007).

Language use by young Japanese and British in MPMs is investigated from two points of view: 1) how apologies are received and responded to by the recipients of MPMs; and 2) how mobile phone technology can be used to manipulate the features of Japanese writing to create desired effects and impressions. The results in Japanese show that both the stylistic features of the received messages and personal distance influence the recipients' evaluations and their verbal responses. An apology from a distant friend with a casual linguistic style receives the poorest evaluation. The recipients evaluate the situation the most unpleasant, and the apologizer the most insincere and the most untrustworthy among 4 situations. However, their evaluations do not appear to affect their choice of linguistic strategies. Identical strategy types, such as [Acknowledgement of the situation]+[Action announcement] '*All right, I will wait around here.*' shape most of the responses, regardless of the degree of personal distance and linguistic styles. Only a close analysis reveals that the poorest evaluation is reflected in shorter message length, a smaller number of pictorial signs, and a more polite sentence-ending. The results exhibit the recipients' conflicting needs to express their frustration while trying to maintain a good relationship with the apologizer. The British equivalent is at the moment under investigation. By displaying the dynamic interrelation between perception and linguistic production by the users of MPMs, this paper will hopefully demonstrate that language in the mobile phone is a negotiating ground between self representation and being faithful to the social norm.

### References:

- Brown P. and Levinson (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*: Cambridge University Press.  
Meyrowitz, Joshua (1986). *No Sense of Place: The Impact of Electronic Media on Social Behavior*: Oxford University Press.  
Miyake, Kazuko (2007). How Young Japanese Express Their Emotions Visually in Mobile Phone Messages: A Sociolinguistic Analysis. *Japanese Studies* 27(1), 53-72.

## Keeping up Appearances: Face Work in Self- and Addressee-oriented Reference

NEVALA, MINNA

Research Unit for Variation, Contacts and Change in English University of Helsinki

E-Mail: [minna.nevala@helsinki.fi](mailto:minna.nevala@helsinki.fi), [aunio@mappi.helsinki.fi](mailto:aunio@mappi.helsinki.fi)

### *The scope and material of the study*

Referential terms and expressions involve several participant roles, and as a form of description, reference can be used to define the relationships between the writer, the addressee and the referent. Face preservation plays an important role: the writer must take the face wants of others into consideration when choosing a referential term (Murphy 1988). Reference to the writer him/herself or to the addressee can thus be used to alter the writer's situational status. When using third-person reference of the addressee, the speaker may wish indirectly to express superiority (e.g. over a child or a servant), to avoid conflict (e.g. disagreement with the addressee) or to show criticism (e.g. sarcasm, irony). It is not certain, however, that the addressee interprets the writer's attempt to claim a certain status the way the speaker has originally meant it. The addressee may even see the speaker's attempt to avoid conflict as face-threatening and understand the use of third-person reference as an act of hostility (Nevala Forthcoming).

Cecchetto and Stroińska (1996) also see the building of discursive self-image as relating to the concept of face, as it contributes to the definition of the contextual identity of the participants. In some situations, the direct self-reference, i.e. using first-person pronouns, may be considered an imposition of one's subjective view on the addressee/audience. In order to avoid coming through as too authoritative or assertive, the writer may refer to him/herself in the third person and thus may manage to make his/her presence known but still appearing modest and inferior.

The aim of this paper is to study how interpersonal relations and underlying discourse functions are shown in the form and use of person-referential terms in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century letters. I will particularly focus on third-person nominal and pronominal reference oriented towards the addressee and the writer him/herself. The material for the study comes from the *Corpus of Early English Correspondence* (CEEC) and its *Extension* (CEECE) which consist of personal correspondence from four centuries (1400–1800).

### *The functions of reference in the material*

The concepts of in-group convergence and out-group divergence agree with the strategicness of language use and the speaker's ability to perform acts which either save or threaten face. In the material, the use of reference terms is related to attending to the face of any of the three interactants, i.e. the writer, the recipient and the referent.

Doing face work comprises altering distance, whether social or contextual, between the participants of a communicative situation. Nicknames, for example, are often used to indicate that the referent belongs to the writer's in-group, whereas titles may occur when the writer places the referent in the out-group. In her letters, governess Agnes Porter uses a nickname, the form *Po* by which her pupils called her, to refer to herself. In Example (1), she refers both to herself and to the recipient in the third person.

- (1) Lord Stavordale is gone with Cavenagh on a fishing expedition, and **Po** is established at the writing table to chat with **one who is often in her memory, and always in her heart**. [PORTER: Agnes Porter to Lady Mary Talbot (Fox Strangways), 1794, 146]

The material shows that the writer's third-person reference to the addressee or to him/herself can strategically be used to achieve certain communicative goals or, for example, to offer the writer a tool for expressing mood towards the addressee. The use of third-person reference of both the writer and the recipient involves the need to save face of either one or both of the participants. Showing respect towards a more distant addressee is a function often performed by using third-person reference of both correspondents. In Example (2), Josiah Wedgwood's business partner Thomas Bentley refers to himself and the recipient, Erasmus Darwin, in the third person. Bentley is more distant to Darwin than Wedgwood himself, and here he wants to promote Darwin's authority and expertise as a published author.

- (2) Dr. Sir, **Mr. Bentley** never had the Pleasure of seeing **Dr. Darwin**, but shall think himself much honoured by his Friendship, & future Correspondence. I am extremely concerned that your Remarks did not come sooner [...] & if **Dr. Darwin**, Mr. Wedgwood, & **your humble Servant**, cou'd have been altogether, I fancy they could have done it as well as anybody else. [WEDGWOOD: Thomas Bentley to Erasmus Darwin, 1765, III, 253–255]

In the material, we can find three main groups of social and contextual aspects which determine the use of addressee- and self-oriented reference: appearance, attitude and authority. Appearance is a mainly social aspect and concerns the writer's or the addressee's status or role as an inferior or superior participant in the interaction. Status also relates to the contextual aspect of the discussion topic. For example, a writer who is socially inferior to the addressee may feel the need to refer to both him/herself and the addressee in the third person when asking for a favour or expressing gratitude.

The second aspect, attitude, can be either positive or negative. It relates to the contextual mood of the writer which may or may not be influenced by the addressee's initiative or previous response. Both attitude and appearance are interchangeably related to each other and the third aspect, authority, which can also mean impersonalising and distancing. It is probable that the factor underlying the three aspects is the concept of face. All instances of third-person reference to the writer or the addressee are somehow related to either saving, enhancing or attacking one's own or the other participant's face. In these cases, attending to one's face overrides establishing the mutual distance.

## Discursive Approach to Politeness Phenomena in Japanese BBS Interactions

NISHIMURA, YUKIKO

Sheffield Hallam University, UK and Toyo Gakuen University, Japan; E-Mail: [yukiko.nishimura.tyg.jp](mailto:yukiko.nishimura.tyg.jp)

**Keywords:** Japanese; bulletin board systems (BBS); discursive approach; honorifics; discernment

This paper analyses politeness and impoliteness in messages sent to open-access Japanese bulletin board systems (BBS) websites, by applying politeness theories from East and West developed in face-to-face (FTF) interactions. These BBS sites provide an interesting environment in which to observe how politeness is realized among diverse anonymous participants, whose interpersonal relations can be created and maintained only through message exchanges.

The study compares messages sent to two major Japanese BBS websites, where participants discussed the same popular film. It analyses linguistic politeness, particularly honorific forms; in addition it also analyses interactional behaviour, by which I mean positively and negatively perceived speech acts such as showing considerations and making offensive remarks, to explore how the presumed diversity of BBS participants contributes to politeness behaviour. It specifically examines linguistic forms of ‘plain’ versus ‘polite’ honorific (*desu/masu*) styles and interactional behaviour of positive and negative politeness strategies.

By comparing messages from each site as a whole, this study finds as overall characteristics a large difference between the two sites in both linguistic forms and positively and negatively taken speech acts; it finds that the first site is dominated by plain styles (over 90%) in generally short messages, while polite styles are more frequently used (62 % polite vs. 38% plain) in much longer messages on the second site. Analysis of interactional behaviour reveal that while thanking behaviours and apologies commonly appear on both sites, there is a clear difference in the occurrences of face threatening acts in that the first BBS site finds 41 offensive messages out of 968, while the second site has only 1 instance among 308 messages studied.

Micro level analysis on the interactions finds mixtures of polite and plain styles in a single message on both sites. Detailed analyses of these messages reveal that polite styles on the first website are used in a purposeful way in interactions undertaken dominantly in plain styles. On the second website, the opposite phenomena can be observed; plain forms appear in dominantly polite-style messages.

How can theories of politeness explain users’ behaviours on these websites? Brown and Levinson (1987) would analyse interactions in an overall plain forms observed on the first website, due to occurring in an environment where the weightiness of face threat is minimal. There are no substantial interpersonal relations among participants, and they do not need to employ polite forms to maintain relations among them, and thus plain, informal forms suffice. However, this view is incapable of explaining interactions conducted in more polite forms observed on the second website, though they are not necessary.

Ide (1989, 2006) can explain more uses of polite styles of the second website, as Japanese users’ behaviour is in accordance with “discernment”, which means to follow what is expected in the context in order to achieve smooth communication. However, this approach cannot give a satisfactory explanation for the dominant uses of plain, informal styles and impoliteness found in offensive messages on the first website.

Part of the reasons for these wide differences in linguistic forms and interactional behaviours between the two sites can be ascribed to differences in technological settings of each website. However, while one solution to the above conflicting phenomena can be found by incorporating concepts of online communities, which I have reported elsewhere (Nishimura 2007), here a third theory of politeness from a discursive approach (Locher 2006) seems to explain these contrasting situations of style mixtures.

In an environment where plain styles dominate on the first site, which means plain styles are contextually appropriate, the polite styles can be seen as negatively marked with specific effect of implying a contesting attitude. The kind of marked polite styles seems to indicate challenge or protest to those who have previously made disparaging remarks, taking a superficially conceding stance with an honorific form, but in fact trying to protest. This is also signalled by an accompanying phrase, “so what” after the polite form.

On the second website where both uses of polite and plain forms are observed in one message, both forms fall on appropriate use. Users’ mixture of styles in one message is not a matter of appropriateness or politeness but rather signals a shift in stance; polite honorific forms can signal the users’ stance to talk formally and publicly to the entire thread (Cook 2006), whereas the plain form can be interpreted as a private talk to only to self. Thus by changing styles in their messages, participants manipulate interactional stances, such as cooperative participant to the site or challenger, or simply allow other users to share the posters’ inner feelings. These interpretations can be made possible by viewing interactions in context as fluid. This study demonstrates that a discursive approach to politeness can explain participants’ uses of linguistic forms in Japanese BBS interactions, where different norms for appropriateness exist.

### Some Problems with the Concept of Face: A Review

O'DRISCOLL, JIM

University of Huddersfield; E-mail: [J.O'Driscoll@hud.ac.uk](mailto:J.O'Driscoll@hud.ac.uk)

**Keywords:** face; faces; facework; interaction

As a way of referring to that part of human particularity which operates in (or at least relates to) interaction, the concept of face enjoys widespread currency. Its appeal lies in its availability as a link (or at least a median) between the (macro) sociolinguistic concern for identity and the (micro) pragmatic concern for individual positionings within interaction.

This widespread, sometimes loose, employment of the term has thrown up several questions regarding the most helpful way to construe its nature, relevance and applicability. Among them are:

- To what range of communicative behaviour is the concept potentially relevant?
- When, and to what extent, is it *actually* relevant?
- How is/are face(s) constructed? Does face exist only in communication? If, as is increasingly argued, face is a discursive construct, then people's faces are constantly subject to change, both with respect to their value and contents. How do these two aspects interact?
- What is/are face(s) constructed *from*? What are the relative contributions of personal wants, personal reputation, culture and situation?
- What is/are face(s) constructed *of*? Answers vary from a specific, very limited set of aspects (in Brown & Levinson, just two) to a vast, open-ended number of them.
- How can we distinguish face from other ways of referring to individual traits (e.g. self-image, self-esteem, personality, identity, reputation)?
- Can we accommodate in our theorising both an emic, culturally and situationally specific concept (face1) and also an etic, culturally neutral concept (face2)?

This paper will do little more than identify such questions and show why they are important. It is not intended as a reductionist call for a universally agreed definition but rather as an exercise in awareness-raising so that when one of us employs the term, we at least know what we mean by it *at the time*.

---

### The Modals as Pragmatic Softening Devices: Evidence from Late Modern English Grammar and Manner Books

OBARA, HIROSHI

E-Mail: [hirobauk@yahoo.co.jp](mailto:hirobauk@yahoo.co.jp)

In this research I consider the evidence provided by a corpus of Late Modern English grammars for our understanding of the development of the modals as politeness markers. With such a resource (that is, the grammar book) being written by authorities, it is possible to see how the modals and their accompanied senses are explained in an official (and often either prescriptive or proscriptive) perspective. This is another aspect which cannot be ascertained from the usage based corpora which seem to be popular as sources of evidence in historical pragmatics. In this sense, this research brings some novel perspective to this aspect of academic study.

The period of Late Modern English was the time when the publication of the grammar books of English both emerged and flourished (Michael 1970). It is reasonable to suggest that the books were popular and influential among certain socially mobile groups given their popularity in the education hungry society (Beal 2004, Görlach 1999, 2001, Michael 1970). In addition, it seems that 'politeness' of a particular kind was something which people wanted to acquire as a marker of their social behaviour and attitude (Morgan 1994, Watts 2002). On the other hand, 'mood' was normally regarded in the grammar book as an aspect of linguistic expression which represented a state of mind. In such descriptions of mood, certain relationships between the modal auxiliary verb and the accompanied significations are introduced. It is possible to notice that the significations involves concept or senses which extend across a semantic – pragmatic domain which includes politeness. We can see that certain softening senses are key elements to mark polite usage. The research looks at some historical (diachronic) grammaticalisation processes which are pointed out as semantic – pragmatic or concrete – abstract sequences (Traugott 1989, Heine 1993, Ziegeler 2003), and at a synchronic analysis of the network processes involved in the conceptualisation of modality.

The main data used come from the descriptions of the modal auxiliary verb in a corpus of grammar books from the period. Usage and manner books are also consulted as a secondary resource. The manner book in particular is quite helpful for our understanding of how linguistic politeness was regarded at the time. Such texts also help us to find a certain network of senses which are related to polite expressions. Moreover, some general observations of politeness and eighteenth/nineteenth century British society are looked at to locate the linguistic phenomena within a wider context.

## On (Im)politeness Behind the Iron Curtain

OGIERMANN, EVA

Seminar für Anglistik, Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg,

E-Mail: [Eva.Ogiermann@uni-oldenburg.de](mailto:Eva.Ogiermann@uni-oldenburg.de)

SUSZCZYŃSKA, MAŁGORZATA

Szegedi Tudományegyetem (SZTE), Angol-Amerikai Intézet, Angol Tanszék.

E-Mail: [suszczyńska@lit.u-szeged.hu](mailto:suszczyńska@lit.u-szeged.hu)

**Keywords:** (im)politeness, economic factors, cultural values, East European countries

While there is very rich literature on politeness in West and East, Eastern European languages have received relatively little attention in politeness research. Although linguistic politeness has been studied in these countries, the research has focused mostly on questions of linguistic etiquette, appropriateness and norms of usage, with relatively few cross-cultural studies attempting to explain politeness in terms of underlying culture-specific ‘values’.

During the past century, the countries constituting the ‘socialist block’ underwent major political and economic changes which had a great impact on politeness norms and the conversational styles of their citizens. There are a few recent studies that address some changes in linguistic politeness in Eastern Europe taking place since the fall of the Iron Curtain (Kronhaus 2004, Huszcza 2005, Bencze 2005, Marcjanik 2007, Rathmayr 2007). However, we believe that in order to better understand the influence of market economy and Western values on politeness in these countries, we also need to take into account the period before 1989.

The enforcement of socialism after World War II led to the imposition of collectivist mentality and the norms and values of the ‘proletariat’. In addition, political oppression and permanent shortages of basic goods led to new power constellations affecting public face-to-face communication, particularly in service encounters and in interactions between representatives of state institutions and citizens. In examining the influence of economic factors on interactional style we refer to the parallel between money and politeness drawn by Werkhofer (1992). Both are viewed as symbolic media deriving their functions from values; and both were subject to devaluation in the former socialist countries. The changes since the fall of the Iron Curtain seem to make the citizens of these countries particularly aware of the relation between money and politeness as the increasingly polite style characterizing service encounters is often evaluated critically (Zemskaja 1997, Marcjanik 2007).

In our paper, we focus on this specific type of (im)politeness that had developed behind the Iron Curtain, focusing on Poland and, to a lesser extent, on Hungary and Russia. Since there is hardly any literature on the topic, we derive our data from films and newsreels from the period, and supplement them with interviews with native speakers. At the same time, we take into account that the perception of what constitutes (im)politeness is culture-specific and that values rooted in a culture’s traditions persist despite changes brought about by political or economic factors. Interesting insights into the culture-specificity of politeness can be obtained through etymological analysis: While the English words *polite* and *courteous* link politeness with behavioral norms of court society (Watts 2003), the Polish adjectives *uprzejmy* and *grzeczny* imply straightforwardness, and the Russian word *vežlivyj* knowledge – though the Hungarian adjective *udvarias* has similar connotations to the English *courteous* or German *höflich*.

Slavic cultures have been shown to differ from the Anglo-Saxon concept of politeness dominating politeness research in that they are characterized by (different forms of) straightforwardness, interpersonal warmth, cordiality, emotionality and spontaneity (Wierzbicka 1991, Zemskaja 1997, Bergelson 2003, Rathmayr 2007). These cultural values are manifestations of ‘connectedness’ (Arundale 2006) or ‘positive politeness’ (Brown & Levinson 1987) – though the politeness type associated with ‘separateness’ or ‘negative politeness’ has become more salient during the past two decades.

In attempting to account for the multifaceted concept of politeness in the former socialist countries we will draw on recent contributions to politeness theory (Spencer-Oatey 2000, 2002 & 2005, Mills 2003, Bargiela-Chiappini 2003, Watts 2003, Locher & Watts 2005, Locher 2006, Haugh 2007). These approaches seem particularly valuable for the purpose of our study as they include the full spectrum of behavior from polite to impolite, and recognize the negotiable, evaluative and discursive nature of politeness. However, although these approaches allow us to move away from what has been termed ‘second-order politeness’ underlying Brown and Levinson’s framework, they also posit conceptual and methodological challenges to researchers, while a new, coherent politeness theory is still in the making.



**A Discourse-oriented Model for Analysing Power and Politeness in Negotiation Interaction: A Cross-linguistic Perspective**

PARAMASIVAM, SHAMALA

University Putra Malaysia; E-Mail: [shamala@putra.upm.edu.my](mailto:shamala@putra.upm.edu.my)

**Keywords:** qualitative research design; discourse analysis; power and politeness; negotiation discourse

This paper draws on linguistic theories that have universal status – Locher's (2004) approach to power, Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory for politeness, Watts' (1991) notion of social network and Goffman's (1974, 1981) understanding of frame – in order to develop a model that would enable power and politeness to be analysed through language use in negotiation interaction. The model forwards a theoretical framework as well as a method for analysis that enables the identification and delineation of power practices in negotiation discourse. Together, the theoretical framework and the method for analysis form a microscope that facilitates a discourse analysis of power and politeness in negotiation talk. The model addresses the identification of speech acts and discourse strategies for negotiation, how they function as negotiation strategies from the perspective of power and politeness and how the exercise of power and politeness influences the process and outcomes of negotiation interaction, with respect to whose interests and what interests are privileged. Data from negotiation interactions between Malay and Japanese businessmen are presented to illustrate the model.

**Politeness and Style in *The Betrothed* (*I promessi sposi*, 1840):  
An Italian Novel by Alessandro Manzoni**

PATERNOSTER, ANNICK

Università della Svizzera Italiana, Lugano, University of Leeds; E-Mail: [apaternoster@btinternet.com](mailto:apaternoster@btinternet.com)

In a most recent publication on *Methods in Historical Pragmatics* (Fitzmaurice - Taavitsainen, 2007) there is a strong consensus for the need to relate past language use to text type (genre). Language use changes between genres as, within the genre, natural use appears to be conventionalised into a fairly stereotypical use. The main idea is that corpus-based research should check findings against qualitative analysis of genre-contextual factors as cross genre analysis might distort the distribution of a specific use.

Now what about the writer? Hardly a handful of contributions in this volume ask attention for microanalysis because of the creative individuality of the author. The author might override genre conventions or mix genres to innovate. Del Lungo Camiciotti and Fitzmaurice therefore advocate a closer look at intertextuality. The most exciting contribution (from my point of view) is by Lynne Magnusson who shows how intertextuality with a well read didactic text by Erasmus can offer a socially specific explanation - through the notion of 'dialogue script' - for the use of 2<sup>nd</sup> person pronouns in a set of Shakespearean sonnets that in the past has been dismissed as anomalous and merely 'poetic'. I would like to join Magnusson in underlining that the notion of genre should be seen against the background of a plurality of literary contexts. It seems to me that at this moment in historical pragmatics the notion of genre, as an explanatory category, is somewhat overstretched. Intertextuality could soften the edges. Intertextuality must consider the genre at stake, but it is broad enough to include the wider literary background of a specific text.

How use intertextuality in historical politeness research? Gino Eelen's and Richard Watt's plea for a paradigm shift that should start out with lay perception of politeness, called (im-)politeness1, has made them pay attention to the history of politeness manuals and to the question of how these interfere with usage through notions like sharedness and competence. It seems methodologically correct to make more use of the canonical behavioural and rhetorical literature of a given period as a strong intertext for the study of politeness features in constructed dialogues of that period (but not exclusively, since many rhetorical texts were schoolbooks and might have influenced non-literary kinds of speech-like writing).

In line with Magnusson, I would refer to the intertextuality of 'dialogue scripts' to conduct a micro-analysis of politeness features in the dialogues of a very influential Italian 19<sup>th</sup> Century novel: I would like to exploit the renewed attention for the history of (im-)politeness1 – in this case the Italian tradition of behavioural treatises - using it as intertext for the construction of dialogues in this novel. After a socio-cultural situation of the genre, looking at the external circumstances of production and intended public (strongly marked by the rise of the middle class), I would focus on the complicated internal context of the work, a historical novel reporting events that took place at the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> Century through the popular device of the accidental discovery of a manuscript. There is a 17<sup>th</sup> Century anonymous narrator (author of the manuscript) and a supposedly faithful scribe, Manzoni, who adds his own comments to the pretend transcription, and then there are the characters, spread out over all levels of society from high nobility to peasants and simple labourers, who have conversations within, but very often across, class boundaries. Among literary critics, the novel is known for the beauty of its dialogues, although there is only one major study dealing with the subject from the point of view of stylistic variety (Petrocchi, 1965).

The style of the direct speech varies obviously according to the social level of the characters. Different characters master different levels of verbal skill, which in the end boil down to the skill of the author to play with style registers. The novelty of this 'novel' is exactly the fact that the plot is based on characters extracted from the lowest social ranks. How do Renzo, a young weaver, and Lucia, a peasant girl, speak? Which style features does Manzoni use to recreate a socially low ranked dialogue? How much is he influenced by traditional dialogue scripts as dictated by behavioural/rhetorical models and genre models, in the knowledge that Manzoni wants to move the Italian novel away from the libertine entertainment of 17<sup>th</sup> Century novel and embrace a religious educative function, which seems very much present as a Marian intertext for Lucia's modesty? In this methodological endeavour I would like to refer to the notions of discursive struggle and hearer evaluation introduced by Eelen and Watts, making ample use of characters'/narrator's/scribe's comments on (im-)politeness to determine its function in Manzoni's work in a way that makes sense to his (many) middle class 19<sup>th</sup> Century readers.

In the end my purpose is to ask attention for style in literary dialogue as a socio-cultural filter between the scholar and past natural language use, keeping in mind that the founder of literary stylistics, Leo Spitzer, always has stressed the intimate link between language stylistics and literary stylistics: *Stilsprache* and *Sprachstile* mirror each other.

## Where Aspects of Self and Face (do not) Surface in Interaction

RUHI, ŞÜKRIYE

Middle East Technical University; E-Mail: [sukruh@metu.edu.tr](mailto:sukruh@metu.edu.tr)

The present paper addresses a methodological issue regarding the study of the enactment of face in naturally occurring discourse. Postmodern approaches to social interaction and studies on (im)politeness in particular have argued that *post facto* evaluations of interaction may not necessarily reflect explicit or implicit evaluations that actually occurred during the interaction and that these evaluations create another interaction during which other presentational concerns may be impacting this interaction (e.g. Mills 2003). Partly in response to this issue, scholars in communication and (im)politeness have underscored the need to closely examine participant uptake in unfolding discourse to unravel interlocutors' assessments of ongoing interaction (e.g., Arundale 2005; Haugh 2007; Terkourafi 2001). The same methodological issue is relevant to the study of face. The question that this paper addresses is whether analysts can and should rely solely on participant uptake in his/her investigation of face phenomena to investigate the participants' understandings. This question is crucial to the study of face as understanding how people construe social interaction is as important as how social interaction is constructed (Hammersley 2003).

The paper addresses this question on a set of spoken data compiled for the purpose of investigating face and (im)politeness expressions in Turkish discourse. The paper first briefly overviews findings on Turkish face (Ruhi, *fc*, Ruhi and Işık-Güler (2007)). It then proceeds on to a close analysis of a number of excerpts that involve exchanges related to 'classificatory face' (a term constructed as an analogy to the concept of "classificatory politeness" in Eelen (2001), that is, exchanges where participants voice judgements about face and face-related issues either in the actual interaction or in *post facto* contexts. This analysis suggests that how people evaluate face-related phenomena may not necessarily emerge in the ongoing interaction as what people actually say may not reflect or be at odds with what they say they felt during the interaction. These findings imply that understanding people's expectations regarding face, the (linguistic) norms which they believe are/should be operative, and the values that they uphold in interaction may be better investigated with the complementary methods of conversation analysis and ethnographic investigations that tap people's judgements of actual discourse.

The paper concludes with a brief description of the findings of an ongoing diary study in Turkish that probes participants' reports of face sensitive interactions with respect to what happened in the interaction, what they said/did and what they did not do/say. These findings suggest that combining the study of naturally occurring discourse along with *post facto* evaluations and ethnographic studies can better equip analysts in developing emic and etic ontologies for the study of face.

### References:

- Arundale, Robert. 2005. Pragmatics, conversational implicature, and conversation. In K. Fitch and R. Sanders (eds.), *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 41–63.
- Eelen, Gino. 2001. *A Critique of Politeness Theories*. Manchester: St. Jerome's Press.
- Hammersley, Martyn. 2003. Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: methods or paradigms. *Discourse & Society* 14 (6): 751–781.
- Haugh, Michael. 2007. The co-constitution of politeness implicature in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39 (1): 84–110.
- Mills, Sara. 2003. *Gender and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ruhi, Şükriye. (*fc*). Evoking face in self and other presentation in Turkish. In F. Bargiela-Chiappini and M. Haugh (eds.), *Face Communication and Social Interaction*. London: Equinox.
- Terkourafi M 2001 *Politeness in Cypriot Greek: A frame-based approach* Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge.

**Modes of Address in Professional Discourse in Georgian  
(Comparison of Medical and Administrative Discourse)**

RUSIESHVILI, MANANA

Tbilisi State University; E-mail: [manana\\_rusieshvili@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:manana_rusieshvili@yahoo.co.uk)

**Keywords:** politeness; medical; administrative; discourse; power

Previous research into issues of linguistic politeness in Georgian concerned face-saving factors in cross-cultural perspective and did not employ analysis of empirical data. Therefore there is a clear necessity to study the manifestations of linguistic politeness in Georgian in various professional settings including the medical and administrative environments.

The current study of address forms in Georgian is based on the general framework of Brown and Levinson's theory. The paper explores:

- i) which politeness strategies (in Brown and Levinson's terms) are used predominantly by the parties involved in the medical and administrative discourse in Georgia;
- ii) how usage of politeness strategies varies between in-group and out-group relations;
- iii) how power and distance are arranged in Georgian using two types of data: doctor-patient, doctor-nurse interaction on the one hand and dean (coordinator) - student interaction on the other.

In order to explore the above-mentioned objectives in medical and administrative discourse I studied the data recorded at medical and educational institutions of Georgia. The data for the medical discourse came from two Medical Institutions of Tbilisi. The data reflecting administrative discourse were recorded at two Georgian Universities: the Deans' office of the Faculty of Humanities of Grigol Robakidze University (GRU), Tbilisi which is a small private university and also the office of the Coordinator of Western European languages at the faculty of Humanities, Tbilisi State University (TSU) which is one of the major universities of Georgia..

In addition to analysing the data I used findings taken from: a) questionnaires and b) interviews with doctors and nurses as well as deans, coordinators and university teachers.

In the article I will argue that address forms expressing deference in Georgian generally follow negative politeness strategies (distancing address forms such as honorific + FN, FNT, V form of second person pronoun and corresponding form of a conjugated verb). Conversely, involvement is expressed by address forms associated with involvement / positive politeness strategies which in Georgian comprise FNT, honorific + FN combined with the T form and a singular form of a conjugated verb-form. Nevertheless, sometimes it is hard to differentiate between positive and negative politeness strategies as some address forms (dependent on the environment) can be successfully used to express deference as well as involvement. Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies do not explain the change of meaning occurring in occasional contexts. Arguably in such cases the definitive role is played by the social context as well as by the lexical choice of words accompanying the address forms. This particularly refers to the verb-forms which quite often exist in three register forms in Georgian – neutral, formal and rude.

I will also argue that the types of professional discourse dealt with in the article reveal similar as well as differing features regarding the use of address forms with in-group/out-group people. In both types of discourse institutional members use predominantly negative politeness strategies while interacting with out-group people whereas while interacting with in-group people they prefer positive politeness strategies. On the other hand people of higher status also use negative politeness strategies while interacting with people of the lower rank. In the medical settings the factors forming in-groups are familiarity, status and age (in this order). In the administrative discourse the same constituents are arranged in a different way: age, status and familiarity. Thus in cases of administrative discourse age differences may override familiarity and status differences. In addition, somewhat asymmetrical relations are revealed between in-group members belonging to different age groups in both types of discourse though they may be expressed differently. As the data confirmed younger members of the same in-group in medical discourse still find it important to mark status and age differences by using *TFN*, *honorific FN* or *deida (aunt) + FN*. On the other hand involvement may also be expressed by prosodic means accompanying the communicative act. Conversely, in administrative discourse the parties don't usually use *TFN* and *deida (aunt) + FN*. *Honorific + FN* is commonly used in all cases while addressing older staff members as well as those of a higher status.

Generally, address modes combined with appropriate verb-forms can serve as markers of in-group relationships, power and social distance, by choice of which the institutional members perform their institutional as well as interpersonal functions simultaneously creating the atmosphere of familiarity/involvement or deference. In professional discourse positive politeness strategies, and sometimes terms of endearment and family relationships are used by Institutional members to create an atmosphere of friendliness and solidarity, whereas negative politeness strategies are used to create an atmosphere of deference, lessen the risk of confrontation and mark out-of group relations.

## **A Sociolinguistic Study of Gender Differences in the Use of Compliments in Iraq**

SALLO, IBRAHIM

University of Dohuk; E-Mail: [dribrahimsallo@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:dribrahimsallo@yahoo.co.uk)

Politeness involves “showing interest, complimenting and sympathizing, using friendly address terms, endearments, etc.” (quoted in Oches 1987:59; Philips and Reynolds 1987:92). Much has been written about Gender Differences (henceforth GDs) and polite language. Many studies have stressed that women are more polite than men (Brown 1979, 1980; Lakoff 1973a, 1975). Sociolinguists in western countries have embarked on investigating Gender Differences (henceforth GDS). Unfortunately, they have received little attention from Arab sociolinguists.

In Iraq, the phenomenon of ‘politeness’ is largely connected with women since they usually avoid insults, and ‘taboo’ expressions. They use polite expressions to in requests, asking questions, taking permission, apologizing, joking, blaming others. A compliment refers to the cases when we express our admiration, astonishment and appreciation. Females and Males usually express compliments differently in Iraq as a result of being socialized differently.

This study investigates compliments and attempts to tackle the linguistic and extra-linguistic (i.e., psychological, sociological and academic) constraints of language of courtesy expressions among the people in Mosul/Iraq. The paper introduces the phenomenon of compliments, hypotheses, purpose of the study, definitions of related concepts, and procedures of data collection. It also attempts to shed light on the nature of GDs in compliments, causes, and sociolinguistic restrictions imposed on them, and how, where and why they occur. It is hypothesized that women and men express compliments differently. Efforts are supposed to identify the GDs in compliments and incorporate them into textbooks.

This empirical study is based on qualitative and quantitative approach in analyzing the corpus. It is based on data collected from 100 informants (50 Fs vs 50 Ms) born in Iraq, aged between 18 and 60 speakers of Iraqi dialects. Using a variety of ways that include social participation, personal observation, interviews, questionnaires and utilising tapes. Questionnaires involved the description of some situations, for which the respondents were asked to mention how they would compliment in them. The results are reported in the analysis.

The hypotheses and objectives of the empirically collected data are presented along with a linguistic analysis. It is hypothesized that there are certain features and formulae of compliments with reference to the use of some expressions rather than others. By showing that compliments occur systematically, we can refute the popular bias that compliments are utterly unsystematic. Suggestions are advanced about when, how and why compliments occur, emphasizing the impact of the sociolinguistic variables (i.e., topic, setting, and participants including their age, sex, education, rural vs. urban and socioeconomic background) as well as psychological, academic, social motivations, mood and purpose. The study highlights the role of sociolinguistic variables in reflecting GDs in compliments which do not form an arbitrary.

Compliments call for further studies dealing with outstanding questions such as: (i) whether Compliments have universal linguistic constraints, (ii) whether they are related more to competence or to performance; and (iii) whether the native speakers and the foreign learners of Ar have a similar competence in using them (Sallo 1983: 78).

Finally, some findings, conclusions are drawn and some recommendations are made to give a comprehensive picture of compliments. The conclusions call for future studies so as to give clear picture of GDs in compliments in the Arab World in general.

---

## **Hierarchy and Attitude Using T/V Forms in 16-17th Century Hungarian**

SÁROSI, ZSÓFIA

Eötvös Loránd University, Hungary; E-Mail: [sarosizs@t-online.hu](mailto:sarosizs@t-online.hu)

It was the period of Middle Hungarian (16-18th century) when the polite V form was developed. The transition from 2nd person singular T form to 3rd person singular V was marked by mixed forms (address term in 2nd person but the verb after it in 3rd person singular) and also by changing from V to T (or vice versa) in the same coherent text.

In my paper I intend to use two different sources – personal letters and witness depositions of witchcraft trials – to demonstrate how the language users of two different classes (the nobility and the commoners) represent their (and the recipient's) real or presumed social status and personal attitude by the help of the old T form and the just forming new V form and the address terms belonging to them. How they express e.g. power and solidarity, distance and closeness, face and face threatening, politeness and impoliteness.

Since it has no tradition of applying the sociopragmatic viewpoint of the “pragmatic turn” in Hungarian historical linguistics (though many studies referred and refer more or less to the non-linguistic reasons of the linguistic changes), this paper focuses on the questions and problems of this new way of examining old Hungarian texts.

## **An Ethnography of Multilingual Situations: Analyzing Politeness in Code-Switching**

SATO, YOICHI

Meisei University; E-Mail: [yoichist@hotmail.com](mailto:yoichist@hotmail.com)

**Keywords:** multilingualism, code-switching, discourse analysis, politeness, power relation

I have been longitudinally involved in a multilingual environment since 2005, and encountered many situations where more than one language is used at one time for the purpose of communication. Therefore, this experience led me to a research question to investigate what is going on in the selection of language, what factors cause code-switching in the environment, and how[for what purposes] they are used there. This intellectual curiosity about the mystery of languages eventually led me to the study of code-switching and language selection in multilingual environment.

By reviewing the literature, I found that there are many factors that cause code-switching in multilingual environment. Nevertheless, studies on code-switching, in the most part, have investigated the psycholinguistic and speaker-centered aspects such as why, when, and how people change their language. Therefore, this current study is so unique in that it employs sociolinguistic perspectives to look at code-switching in terms of 1) politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Scollon & Scollon, 2001; Koester, 2004, etc), and 2) facework (Goffman, 1955), and 3) power Relation (Fairclough, 1989), which few studies have focused upon so far.

This qualitative research investigates the factors that influence the selection of languages by native speakers of Japanese and Chinese who participated in a summer intensive Chinese course conducted at Meisei University [Meisei Summer School Project: MSSP] as instructors. The data collection was conducted in a preparation period of the course, where all the participants had to use three common languages [Japanese, English, and Chinese] to work with native speakers of Chinese. The data in this study is collected through video-taping, audio-recording, field-note taking, interview, and questionnaire, based on which the corpus on code-switching is established with over 20,000 words registered.

### **References:**

- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Goffman, E. (1955). "On Face-work: An Analysis of Ritual Elements of Social Interaction". *Psychiatry: Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes*. 18(3), 213-231.
- Koester, A.J. (2004). "Relational sequence in workplace genres", *Journal of Pragmatics* 36 (2004), pp.1405-1428, Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Scollon, R. and Scollon, S.W. (2001). *Intercultural Communication*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

### (Im)Politeness and Activity Type

SILVEIRA, SONIA BITTENCOURT  
UFJF, MG, Brazil; E-Mail: [soniabit@terra.com.br](mailto:soniabit@terra.com.br)  
OLIVEIRA, MARIA DO CARMO LEITE DE  
PUC-Rio, Brazil; E-Mail: [mdocarmo@terra.com.br](mailto:mdocarmo@terra.com.br)

**Keywords:** (im)politeness; activity type; conciliation hearings

Social-pragmatic studies have been sensitive to three types of dualities, which have raised questions and tensions in social sciences (Layder, 1994 and Coupland, 2001); these dualities are macro-micro, structure-agency, and society-individual. With respect to studies on politeness, one of the controversies concerns the view of politeness as a norm imposed by social conventions (Xie, 2007), and this controversy involves the question of structure and agency in the explanation of (im)polite behavior. In the present paper, we seek to bring further depth to this discussion, through a proposal in which an activity-type based analytic framework (Levinson, 1979 and Sarangi, 2000) may shed light on the way that normative aspects and individual factors are imbricated in the evaluation of (im)polite behavior. The corpus that this discussion is based on was generated in conciliation hearings, a social episode, in which there is interaction between a mediator representing an agency of consumer defense, a complainant (the consumer) and a respondent (provider of goods or services). Our analysis shows that, on the one hand, the goal of the encounter (to reach an agreement) is one of the restrictions that define the contributions that are allowed in terms of (un)appropriate / (im)polite behavior. On the other hand, individual factors, such as educational background, gender identity, and different degrees of social skill in the expression of emotions, may also influence the choice and/or evaluation of certain behavior as being (im)polite.

#### References:

- Brown, Penelope and Levinson, Stephen C. (1978). Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomena. In E.N. Goody (ed.) *Questions and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 56–289.
- Coupland, Nikolas.(2001) Introduction: Sociolinguistic theory and social Theory. Coupland, N, Sarangi,S. and Candlin C.N. (eds.) *Sociolinguistics and social Theory*.England: Pearson Education Limited,1-26.
- Gu, Yueguo (1990). Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14(2), 237–257.
- Layder,Derek.(1994) Understanding Social Theory.London:Sage.
- Levinson, S. (1979). “Activity types and language”. *Linguistics*, 17 (5/6): 365-399
- Mills, Sara (2003). *Gender and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sarangi, S. (2000) Activity types, discourse types and interactional hybridity: the case of genetic counselling. In S. Sarangi and M. Coulthard eds., *Discourse and Social Life*. London: Pearson, 1-27.
- Xie, Chaoqun.(2007) “Controversies about politeness”. In Dascal, Marcelo and Han-liang Chang (eds.), *Traditions of Controversy*, 249–266.

## Politeness in British-Chinese Intercultural Interaction

STADLER, STEFANIE and SPENCER-OATEY, HELEN  
Centre for English Language Teacher Education, University of Warwick;  
E-Mail: [s.a.stadler@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:s.a.stadler@warwick.ac.uk), [helen.spencer-oatey@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:helen.spencer-oatey@warwick.ac.uk)

**Keywords:** politeness; intercultural interaction; Sino-UK

The aim of this paper is to explore how theories of “politeness” can be applied to the analysis of intercultural interaction, and to critically evaluate their relative strengths and limitations for illuminating the intercultural interaction issues that can arise in real life. To this end, this paper will draw on key frameworks and concepts in Politeness Theory, including those developed and expounded by Arundale (2006), Brown and Levinson (1978/1987), Eelen (2001), Leech (1983, 2005, 2007), Spencer-Oatey (2000, 2005, 2007) and Watts (2001). Particular attention is paid to these theorists’ stances on the ways in which cultural factors may impact on communication and/or interaction.

The paper then draws on data from HEFCE’s eChina-UK Programme, and, taking a ‘practitioner’ perspective, it critically evaluates the extent to which current frameworks and concepts can illuminate the various rapport issues that can arise in authentic, ongoing intercultural interaction. The paper ends with some recommendations for future research and applications for training.

### References:

- Arundale, Robert B. (2006) Face as relational and interactional: a communication framework for research on face, facework, and politeness. *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behaviour, Culture* 2 (2): 193–216.
- Brown, Penelope & Levinson, Stephen C. (1987). *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: CUP. Originally published as *Universals in language usage: politeness phenomenon*. In: Esther Goody (ed) (1978) *Questions and Politeness: strategies in Social Interaction*. New York: CUP.
- Eelen, Gino (2001). *A Critique of Politeness Theories*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Leech, Geoffrey N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Leech, Geoffrey (2005). Politeness: is there an East-West divide? *Journal of Foreign Languages*: 6. Available at <http://www.ling.lancs.ac.uk/staff/geoff/leech2006politeness.pdf> [Accessed 2015 February 2007].
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (2000) Rapport management: a framework for analysis. In: H. Spencer-Oatey (ed) *Culturally Speaking: Managing Rapport through Talk across Cultures*. London: Continuum (pp.11–45).
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (2005) (Im)Politeness, face and perceptions of rapport: unpackaging their bases and interrelationships. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 1(1):113–137.
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen (2007) Theories of identity and the analysis of face. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 639–656.
- Watts, Richard J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: CUP.



## Politeness in Bahasa Melayu (Malay): A Case Study of a Malay Family

SULEIMAN, ROZINA

School of Humanities, Universiti Sains Malaysia; E-Mail:

E-Mail: [rrozina@usm.my](mailto:rrozina@usm.my)

SAZALIE, AZIMAH

School of Humanities, Universiti Sains Malaysia; E-Mail:

E-Mail: [azimah@usm.my](mailto:azimah@usm.my)

HASSAN, HASMIDAR

School of Humanities, Universiti Sains Malaysia; E-Mail:

E-Mail: [hasmidar@usm.my](mailto:hasmidar@usm.my)

**Keywords:** linguistic politeness; Malay; politeness notions; family discourse

The study of politeness began in early 1970s with linguists theorising about the concept of politeness that speakers of a language subscribed to in their daily interactions with one another. Essentially, these theories are the scholars' propositions on the nature of linguistic behaviour which constitutes politeness, i.e. linguistic or verbal politeness. Verbal politeness can be defined as the use of linguistic elements such as words and phrases to encode politeness. For example, Lakoff's Rules of Politeness (1973), Leech's Politeness Principles (1983) and Brown and Levinson's Politeness Strategies (1987) are politeness theories which explain politeness in terms of a speaker abiding by a particular linguistic model of politeness. Such explanations are considered scientific notions of politeness since they are conceived by theorists. Furthermore, these theories are considered universal, i.e. they are applicable to all languages and cultures.

Watts (2003) has observed that such theories are inadequate in terms of explaining a speaker's concept of politeness since they are based on the linguist's own understanding of and general assumptions about the concept rather than that of the speaker's. It should be mentioned here that some of these theories have been subjected to empirical research and have been found, to some extent, to be valid. However, the underlying assumption in all these studies is that the actual use of politeness in any language can be explained by an existing politeness model. Watts (2003) has also suggested that such an assumption should be abandoned and that politeness studies should be concerned with lay notions of politeness, i.e. politeness as conceived by the speakers themselves and not as conceived by some model. In addition, a model of politeness should be based on these lay notions in order for it be representative of the concept as held by its users.

As for politeness studies in Bahasa Melayu or Malay Language, the scenario is similar. Malay linguists have proposed that certain linguistic elements encode politeness in Malay. For example, the use of indirectness (Asmah Omar, 1992), address terms (Nik Safiah Karim, 1992), and idioms and adages (Wan Abdul Kadir, 1993). These propositions are also based on the linguists' general assumptions about politeness in the Malay language and society. Little study has been done on the Malay speakers' own notions of politeness.

This paper reports on a pilot study that examines politeness in Malay society from the perspective of the users of rather than the scholars in the language. The focus of the study is a Malay family's general concept of politeness and that of verbal politeness. Interviews and observations are used in the study to identify these notions of politeness. This paper also discusses these lay notions of politeness in relation to existing notions of politeness in the Malay language and society, in particular and to universal concepts of politeness, in general.

### References:

- Asmah Haji Omar (1992). Indirectness as a Rule of Speaking among the Malays. In Asmah Haji Omar (ed.) *The Linguistic Scenery in Malaysia*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 175-186.
- Lakoff, R. (1973). The logic of politeness: or minding your p's and q's. *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 292-305.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman.
- Nik Safiah Karim (1992). *Beberapa Persoalan Sosiolinguistik Bahasa Melayu*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Wan Abdul Kadir (1993). *Budi sebagai Asas Budaya Melayu*. Petaling Jaya: Masfami Enterprise.
- Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Relational Work in Intercultural Business Interaction: Cases from East-West Encounters**

TANAKA, HIROMASA

Meisei University: Email: [tanakahi@eleal.meisei-u.ac.jp](mailto:tanakahi@eleal.meisei-u.ac.jp)

**Keywords:** relational work; compliment response; small talk, address forms

In the recent years, there has been an increasing interest in politeness in work place interaction. One aspect of politeness in business that has drawn researchers' attention is relational work which involves attempts to initiate and to engage in small talk. As Coupland (2000) points out, small talk does not only establish rapport but influences the instrumental and transactional goal of institution. Linguistic studies that investigated small talk or relational talk took place in Western business settings identified multiple functions of small talk (e.g. Koester, 2004; Mullany, 2006; Holmes & Stubbe, 2006). Several organizational researchers view small talk as 'life blood of organizations (Boden, 1994, p.215.); and as "a valuable source for inquiries into the construction and exercise of managerial leadership (Sjostrand, Sandberg, and Tyrstrup, 2001, p.10).

However results of relational work studies with an emic perspective often show variations in verbal behaviour and underlying values, norms and assumptions among different ethnic and cultural groups. Studies by Wolfson and Manes (1980) and Wolfson (1981) suggest a critical role of compliments in rational work in the United States. The data indicate that a compliment - small talk is an unmarked sequence in natural conversation. Wolfson notes that compliments often initiate conversation, and compliment - response exchange itself constitutes entire speech act that creates and strengthens speaker-hearer solidarity.

Masumoto (1988) provides concrete examples that demonstrate relational work in Japanese language is differently constructed. Such examples include use of honorifics, different forms of verb according to vertical power-relation. Moeran (1988) extended Sugiyama-Lebra's (1976) notion of horizontal in-group and out-group notion to analysis of Japanese verbal behaviour. Ide's cross cultural study (2005) suggest asymmetrical roles of small talk in English and Japanese and argues that the Aisatsu (greeting) in Japanese is used similarly instead of small talk in English. These studies indicate that Japanese relational work inseparably intertwined with other dimensions of various verbal and non-verbal communication. In this aspect, rational work needs to be viewed as "the work individuals invest in negotiating relationship with others, which includes direct, impolite, rude, and other verbal behaviour (see, Locher and Watts, 2005).

Relatively little research, nevertheless, has focused on workplace contexts. Okamura (2005) analyses use of address forms in intercultural business situations and illustrates discursive formation of equilibrium based on the choice of address forms. Fujio's study (2004) of intercultural business meeting reveals variations of relational work resulting from contextual factors result in inter-personal struggles (Fujio, 2004).

The present study attempts to analyze relational work in intercultural business counters framed in the notion of rational work as being constructed in local and situational contexts. This research emerged through in my consultation with Japanese business corporations. In a way, the research question was formulated as a result of joint problematization between the researcher and the researched rather than out of the researcher's academic interest alone. This study utilizes multiple methods of data collection in order to ensure multiple-perspective analysis. The paper demonstrates how the contextual factors and different notions of relational work manifested in English the participants use. The author argues potential misunderstanding between business people with various conceptions of relational work, politeness, and face even though they share the common language. The notion of two-dimensional construction of social relationship among the participants grounded through the data analysis is proposed.

## Construction of Face in Japanese Business Settings

TANAKA, HIROMASA and ZHANG, XIAO RUI

Meisei University; E-Mail: [tanakahi@eleal.meisei-u.ac.jp](mailto:tanakahi@eleal.meisei-u.ac.jp)

In the last two decades, researchers constantly pointed out limitations of the etic notion of face developed by Western academics (e.g., Bargiela-Chiappini, 2003). The claimed universality of Brown and Levinson's politeness theory was challenged by researchers who examined applicability of the politeness theory in interaction involving Japanese (e.g. Matsumoto, 1988). Furthermore Haugh's meta-linguistic research (2005) revealed the multiple interrelated notions of face in Japanese language. However, how Western speakers' individual-based notion of face and Japanese notion of face interplay in intercultural interaction still remain insufficiently explored.

Recent discussions of face and facework emphasize the need to view face as interactional rather than individual phenomena and suggest the importance of examining contextual and situational face construction and facework in action (Arundale, 2006; Earley, 2003). Nevertheless few studies to date have investigated face from a discursive perspective, in particular in business settings.

The focus of the paper is to provide a view of face construction and negotiation from a local and situational perspective using the data from business people in intercultural environments. This paper illustrates how such an emic notion of face is manifested in the participants' intercultural encounters.

The study employs multiple methods. In the first step, the researchers analyse Internet and major Japanese newspaper corpus data and examine subject-verb collocation in order to see the linguistic level association of groups and individuals with face. The data show strong association of face and groups rather than individuals. For example, more than 65% of the verb-objective phrase '*taimen wo yogosu*' (to dirty face) in the examined corpora have groups or groups of people as their subjects.

In the following step, the interview data from the participants of Japanese-Westerner meetings and Japanese-Chinese meetings are analyzed. The data were collected in three different Japanese corporations. In the light of past research on Japanese face, the authors use horizontal, in-and-out-group, dimension (Moeran, 1988), as well as frequently discussed vertical dimension (Matsumoto, 1988) as a framework to analyse the participants' recognition of relationship. One of the findings from the data is that the participants negotiate to situate themselves vertically and horizontally in the business situation and the negotiated social positions of the participants construct their notions of face. The data further show the participants' constructed face particularly influences their turn taking frequency and silence. The study illustrates the participants' concerns about the image of their team as well as themselves unconsciously drives the participants' behaviour in business meetings.

### References:

- Arundale, Robert. B. (2006). 'Face as relational and interactional: A communication framework for research on face, facework, and politeness'. *Journal of Politeness Research*. 2. 193-216.
- Bargiela-Chiappini, Fancesca. (2003). 'Face and politeness: New (insights) for old (concepts)'. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35. 1453-1469.
- Brown, Penelope and Levinson, Stephen C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Earley, Christopher. P. and Ang, Soon. (2003). *Cultural intelligence: Individual interaction across cultures*. Stanford: CA. Stanford University Press.
- Haugh, Michael. (2005). 'What does 'face' mean to Japanese? Understanding the import of face in Japanese business interactions'. In F. Bargiela-Chiappini and M. Gotti. (eds.). *Asian business discourse(s)*. Bern. Peter Lang. 211-239.
- Matsumoto, Yoshiko. (1989). "Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese". *Journal of Pragmatics*. 12. 403-426.
- Moeran, Brian. (1988). 'Japanese language and society: An anthropological approach'. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 12. 427-433.

## Politeness and Interactional Models in Foreign Language Textbooks

TANNER, JOHANNA

Department of Finnish language and literature, University of Helsinki; E-Mail: [johanna.p.tanner@helsinki.fi](mailto:johanna.p.tanner@helsinki.fi)

**Keywords:** textbook dialogues; politeness; directives; interactional models; social identities

My paper deals with dialogues in textbooks for teaching Finnish as a second language. Whether intentional or not, the dialogues provide non-native readers with models of how to *behave* linguistically in the target language. I am interested in how textbook dialogues construct participant roles for the language learner. What kind of models of interaction and what kind of politeness L2 textbook dialogues present to learners?

The corpus for the study is comprised of 10 recently published and widely used Finnish L2 adult textbooks. The paper will focus on two situation types: The first is asking for directions from a stranger (*Anteeksi, voitteko sanoa, missä on rautatieasema?* / *Excuse me, could you tell me where is the railway station?*) and the second is for asking something routine in a service exchange (*Saanko 5 postimerkkiä* / *May I have five stamps*).

It will be argued that textbook dialogues often reduce the richness of authentic interactional patterns to general and sometimes “hyperpolite” utterances. This is especially interesting in informal and routine service situations: even if the speakers are on the same social level, and the requested act is minimal, indirect strategies and distance politeness may prevail. Instead of reflecting spoken language, the prestige of standardised (written) Finnish is maintained. As a consequence, dialogues do not really reflect the sensitivity to different situational contexts that real speakers possess.

The choices made in choosing the appropriate language for a textbook may also tell us something about our attitudes towards L2 learners: do we see them as a part of the target language community or as “others”, outsiders in the language community?

---

## Bridging Micro and Macro Notions of Face: a Greek Case-study

TERKOURAFI, MARINA

University of Illinois; E-Mail: [mt217@uiuc.edu](mailto:mt217@uiuc.edu)

Brown and Levinson’s reformulation of the Goffmanian notion of face has repeatedly met with criticisms of Anglocentricity, while subsequent revisions based on an ever-expanding range of languages have highlighted different aspects of this notion as important in different cultures. One possible conclusion from this line of research is that the quest for an all-encompassing notion of face should be abandoned: all that exists are disparate, local conceptualisations of face that must be reconstructed for different societies at different times. An alternative to this sweeping conclusion is that, while these local conceptualisations of face may be all that is psychologically real for speakers and that can be observed in conversational transcripts, an ‘all-encompassing’ notion of face may still be useful as a methodological abstraction, offering a unifying principle from which the various local conceptualisations of face can be generated in different socio-historical and situational settings. Capitalizing on a distinction, now current within politeness studies, between Politeness1 and Politeness2, this paper explores this alternative. Face2 is proposed to be biologically grounded in the dimension of approach/withdrawal, and intentional (i.e. *directed* at an Other). It is thus both universal, and uniquely human and irreducibly relational. Face2 as such, however, is an analyst’s tool. To play a role in speakers’ language production and comprehension, the situated contents of Face2 must be ‘fleshed out’ in particular socio-historical circumstances, resulting in a multiplicity of ‘Face1’s operating simultaneously in interaction.

One aspect of the socio-historical context that seems to be particularly relevant to situated conceptualisations of Face1 is the degree of functional diversification within a society. Sociologists such as Durkheim, Elias and Tönnies, have theorised this in different ways. In this paper, I explore the potential of the notions of *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* (Tönnies 1887/2001), respectively corresponding to the pre-industrial/rural and industrial/urban modes of social existence, to flesh out the situated contents of Face1 for contemporary Greek society. A specific hypothesis based on Tönnies’s distinction is that in *Gemeinschaft*, explicit negotiation should be minimal, commonality of origin and purpose guaranteeing shared understandings and serving to amplify the content of indirect modes of communication; while in *Gesellschaft*, explicit negotiation should be necessary to bridge the gap left by the lack of deeper intimacy. This hypothesis is tested for contemporary Greek society by mapping the (changing) distribution of several linguistic devices, including diminutives, the T/V distinction, and responses to thanks.

## Two Ways of Reacting Politely to an Unattainable Request in Japanese

TOSHIYUKI, SADANOBU

Kobe University; E-Mail: [sadanobu@kobe-u.ac.jp](mailto:sadanobu@kobe-u.ac.jp)

**Keywords:** rejection; Japanese; thinking fillers; politeness strategies

Reacting negatively to one's request generally needs especially careful consideration, since it can threaten one's face. Then how can we react politely to an unattainable request? The answer to this question seems to vary from one culture to another. This paper clarifies that Japanese society has developed at least two different ways: (i) Reject the request as soon as possible so that the requester should not waste his/her time; (ii) Show effort to attain the request to the requester even if it is not attainable. Although there may be a dialectal difference, (ii) is widely attested in Japanese society. This can be most clearly observed in the usage of Japanese thinking fillers. As well as many other languages, Japanese has a lot of fillers uttered while the speaker is thinking (Sadanobu and Takubo 1995). The speaker, however, sometimes already knows the result of his/her thinking at the time point of uttering such thinking fillers. For example, a thinking filler *saa* appears only in the course of thinking followed by negative responses (Sadanobu 2002; 2005). In replying to a question "Don't you know a police station around here?", the speaker can say (1) *Saa, chotto wakarimasen* ("Saa, I don't know.") or (2) *Saa, konoatari kooban-wa naito omoimasuyo* ("Saa, I don't think there is a police station around here."), but never (3) *??Saa, kooban-wa asoko-desu* ("??Saa, the police station is there"). Based on over 50 hour recordings of natural conversation and questionnaires, this paper investigates the usage of the filler *saa* and explores the politeness strategy (ii) in Japanese culture. [Work supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Science Research, JSPS, (A)16202006, 19202013.]

### References:

- Sadanobu, Toshiyuki, and Takubo, Yukinori (1995). Danwa-niokeru shinteki sousa monitaa kikou: shinteki sousa hyoushiki *eeto to ano(o)*. Gengo Kenkyu 108, 74–93.  
Sadanobu, Toshiyuki (2002). Un-to soo-ni imi-wa aruka. In T. Sadanobu (ed.), *Un-to soo-no gengogaku*, Tokyo: Hituji Shobo, pp. 75-112.  
Sadanobu, Toshiyuki (2005). Sasayaku koibito, rikimu repootaa. Tokyo: Iwanami.

---

## The Place of Appropriateness in Japanese as a Foreign Language (JFL) Teaching in England An Early Report

TOURNIER, HADRIEN

SOAS, University of London; E-Mail: [h.tournier@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:h.tournier@yahoo.co.uk)

**Keywords:** appropriateness; Japanese as a foreign language learning/teaching; intercultural communication; communicative competence; *wakimae*

It is well established that politeness is a crucial component of human communication (Bargiela-Chiappini, 2003; Brown & Levinson, 1987; Eelen, 2001; Fraser, 1990; Holtgraves, 2001; Kasper, 1990; Lakoff, 1973; Pizziconi, 2006; Watts, 2003), but this importance extends to foreign languages as well. Learning a foreign language is thus not purely about its forms and functions: it is also about acquiring its own conception of *appropriateness*.

This presentation will argue that by acquiring the 'scripts' of L2 (in)appropriateness, learners become better able to speak and behave in what the target community of practice considers an acceptable fashion. In so doing, they are granted better access to the target socio-culture and avoid causes for intercultural communication breakdowns, and thus reach higher communicative competence (Dewaele & Wourm, 2002; Falsgraf *et al.*, 1993; Holme, 2003; Koike, 1989; LoCastro, 1994; Lörcher & Schulze, 1988; Ochs, 1993; Roberts *et al.*, 2001). My early research phases focus on Japanese as a Foreign Language (JFL) in England, but will later expand to a mirrored analysis of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in Japan.

My starting point is the fact that despite the Communicative Approach being widely spread in English schools and encouraged by policy makers, learners are not exposed to sufficient input in class to develop their awareness of (in)appropriateness in JFL. These unsatisfactory contents directly undermine the learners' communicative potential in the target language, and may indirectly help propagating undesirable clichés. This claim relies on the analysis of widely-used teaching materials in JFL, and on data collected from an internal year-long class observation. These will be confronted with results from an ongoing pilot study showing how University of Manchester students of JFL value the notion of L2 appropriateness, and what they expect from instruction.

Through the analysis of the factors at work, I will attempt to make a useful contribution to the field by suggesting ways of improving how Japanese is taught and learnt.

## Social Politeness and Generic Use of 3<sup>rd</sup> Person Personal Pronoun in Korean, Japanese and English

UM, JEONGMI

Kwansei Gakuin University, Japan ; E-mail: [jeongmi36@kwansei.ac.jp](mailto:jeongmi36@kwansei.ac.jp)

**Keywords:** social politeness; pronoun; generic use

In this paper I examine and analyze the relation between gender representation and social politeness in the present usage of generic use of the 3rd person personal pronoun as one of the processes of the gender identity construction in Korean, Japanese and English. As a result, it has turned out that the generic use itself appears in English, Japanese, and Korean even if there are some individual differences.

In the case of English, when the sex of the noun of the antecedent which receives a correspondence was unfixed the generic male form of 3rd person personal pronoun “he” was generically used as a meaning including a woman, but by language reform in the present, the use of “he” has been almost decreasing. In the case of Japanese, although generic use does not appear in singular form of 3rd person personal pronoun, male form of the 3rd person personal pronoun “Karera” of the plural form is generically used as a meaning to contain a woman. In Korean, though the sex of the noun which receives a correspondence has clarified, male form of the 3rd person personal pronoun “Ku” is generically used as a meaning including a woman.

Specifically the generic use in Korean is considered and translated as a language form to show social politeness to women in Korean society. I discuss if the generic use could mean social politeness and what the social politeness means in each language.

---

## A Pragmatic View of Error Treatment in a Classroom of English as a Foreign Language

VICENTE, HELENA

English-Portuguese Department, Catholic University of Brasilia; E-mail: [helenag@ucb.br](mailto:helenag@ucb.br)

RAMALHO, FABIULA

English-Portuguese Department, Catholic University of Brasilia; E-mail: [fabulamr@gmail.com](mailto:fabulamr@gmail.com)

**Keywords:** beliefs; politeness strategies; errors

The aim of our study is to tackle some of our concerns as teachers of English as a foreign language in light of pragmatic notions such as *face* and *politeness* (Goffman, 1967; Brown & Levinson, 1987; Yule, 1996, among many others). We present the results of a research that investigates whether a professor of the English department of a Brazilian university and her undergraduate students share *beliefs* (Goffman, 1959; Horwitz, 1985; Nespor, 1987; Pajares, 1992; Barcelos, 2004) as far as the correction of written assignments is concerned. The professor in question assumes that the most effective way to correct written assignments is to comment on them with each individual student. By analyzing the transcriptions of the recordings of teacher-student interactions in which the compositions are orally and individually commented on, as well as the students' impressions obtained by means of a semi-structured oral interview, we were able to conclude that, in effect, the students seem to share with the teacher the belief that the dynamics of one-on-one correction gives them the opportunity to talk about their errors and mistakes and, therefore, to improve their writing skills. However, a closer analysis of the interactions shows that, in order to mitigate the feeling of embarrassment and uneasiness produced by having to talk about their own errors, the students very commonly resort to negative politeness strategies such as “giv[ing] overwhelming reasons” and making “self-humbling remark[s]”, which are part of a greater strategy known in the literature as “apologizing” (Brown & Levinson, 1987:188-189).

### References:

- Barcelos, Ana Maria (2004). Crenças sobre Aprendizagem de Línguas, Linguística Aplicada e Ensino de Línguas. *Linguagem & Ensino* 7(1), 123-156.
- Brown, Penelope & Levinson, Stephen (1987). *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goffman, Erving (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Anchor Books.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1967). *Interaction Ritual: essays on face to face behavior*. New York: Garden City.
- Horwitz, Elaine K. (1985). Using Student Beliefs about Language Learning and Teaching in the Foreign Language Methods Course. *Foreign Language Annals* 18(4), 333-340.
- Nespor, Jan (1987). The Role of Beliefs in the Practice of Teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 19(4), 317-328.
- Pajares, M. Frank (1992). Teachers' Beliefs and Educational Research: Cleaning Up a Messy Construct. *Review of Educational Research* 62(3), 307-332.
- Yule, George (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

## **How Professors and Students in two Universities in the Philippines *Do* Power and Politeness in the Classroom**

VICTORIA, MABELLE

Open University; E-Mail: [M.Victoria@open.ac.uk](mailto:M.Victoria@open.ac.uk)

**Keywords:** power; politeness; classroom; students; professors

This research investigates how professors and students from two universities in the Philippines linguistically enact power and politeness in the classroom. Professors can be seen to have more power than their students by virtue of their status, age, skill, more knowledge of the subject matter and authority to assign grades (Rees-Miller 1999). In order to promote a safe and nurturing learning environment, they are usually expected to perform the delicate balancing act of achieving the transactional goals of the lesson while at the same time orienting to the relational needs of the students. To encourage critical thinking, teachers may challenge ideas and withhold encouragement, which can threaten the positive and negative face of their students; the very same *face* which they are expected to enhance, protect and attend to. Students, on the other hand may find that their desire for self expression and critical thinking are often in conflict with their desire to pay respect to the professor's status and authority. Using Brown and Levinson's (1987) model of politeness as analytical framework and field notes and audio recordings of lessons as data, this research describes how professors and students *do* power and politeness in the classroom. It explores the difference in strategies that professors and students use to mitigate power with linguistic politeness. Preliminary findings indicate that there is power in solidarity or the degree of 'we-ness' of the class as a group. Negative politeness might help 'oil' the wheels of social interaction but it is solidarity (which is an aspect of positive politeness) that makes all four wheels go together in the same direction, in the first place. Solidarity takes the *a* out of *asymmetry* and makes power available where it is needed in the pursuit of teaching and learning goals.

---

## **Conflict of Power and Face, or is it just a Difference in Culture?: How Does a Novice Claim His Face to Climb the Corporate Ladder in the Second Language?**

WATANABE, YASUHISA

Queensland University of Technology; E-Mail: [y.watanabe@qut.edu.au](mailto:y.watanabe@qut.edu.au)

Based on Goffmanian notion of face, the current understanding of Face is that it is not only given to an interlocutor by their social construct outside of the interactional context but is also constructed and negotiated within the given social group and their interactions (Arundale, 2006). The interlocutor can "claim" face by showing the others in the social group what he/she is capable of doing. The Japanese notion of "Kao" also seems to stand on one's social position and ability, based on what they have achieved in the past. One can "lose" kao if what can be reasonably expected of him/her is not delivered (Haugh & Watanabe, forthcoming).

Power, on the other hand, is possessed by an interlocutor who, socially or otherwise, allowed to force or to influence others to do certain actions, either intentionally or unintentionally (Wartenberg, 1990). The amount of power possessed by a person seems to correspond to the status of the interlocutor in relation to the others in the social group (Watts, 1991).

The definitions of these two notions seem to be closely interrelated; the higher the social status, the more power one may possess, and the more face one must maintain. For example, a company president possesses power over his/her employees, but he/she must also maintain his/her face by displaying how capable he/she is of running the business (cf. Erchul & Raven, 1997). Often, exercising his/her power can enhance his/her face.

At the other end of the spectrum, a member of the social group whose status is relatively low, he/she possesses less face than his/her boss. A young, new employee who is starting out at a new company must follow the same steps to be welcomed by the co-workers and gain face over time. Once he/she is promoted as a result, they must maintain the newly-claimed face by keep showing that they can be a capable member of the company.

In the process of a junior member claiming their face, it can inadvertently threaten a senior member's power and face, especially when the cultural and linguistic background of these members are different. In such cases, a conflict of face and power may occur.

In this paper, the interaction of a discussion held after a product development meeting in a Japanese company is analysed to show how a non-native speaker of Japanese attempts to claim his face and how his superiors, both native and non-native speakers of Japanese, react to such attempts. The aim of this paper is to analyse how conflicting face claims are dealt in a business meeting and yet participants achieve an understanding.

## Politeness in the Classroom: Cross-cultural Issues in Language Learning

WOODMAN, KAREN

Queensland University of Technology; E-Mail: [karencwoodman@hotmail.com](mailto:karencwoodman@hotmail.com)

**Keywords:** learning politeness, cross-cultural differences, ESL

This paper will explore the role of cross-cultural differences in (mis)perceptions of politeness and politeness markers in language learning and language classrooms. The learning focus is frequently assimilative, rather than comparative (e.g., this is the way to do X in target culture, rather than what are the differences between your culture(s) and the target culture(s) in X). The result of this restricted focus is that learners may not recognize significant differences in intent and context in politeness strategies between their language and/or culture and the target language and/or culture, and/or they will (re)interpret politeness strategies and/or markers through the ‘veil’ of their own cultural worldview, resulting in what may be perceived within the target culture as ‘inappropriate’ politeness.

Many ESL/EFL classes include a cultural mix of “East and West”. The classes include students from “Eastern” cultures (e.g., Korea, Japan, China), together with students from “Western” cultures (e.g., Europe, South and Central America) - often taught by teachers from “Western” cultures (e.g., UK, Canada, US, Australia). Not surprisingly, it may be expected that cultural miscommunication may occur. For example, there are the diametrically opposite perceptions of eye contact between Japanese (e.g., eye contact is rude) and North Americans (e.g., eye contact shows trustworthiness, lack of eye contact is rude), may lead to misunderstandings between teacher and student(s), and student(s) and student(s).

In this study, the perceptions of non-native speakers of English regarding ‘appropriate’ politeness in Anglo-Australian culture were explored. Participants considered specific scenarios and contexts for politeness, and compared the Anglo-Australian strategies to those used in their home language/culture and/or other cultures and/or languages with which they were familiar.

---

## Apology Strategies: British and Chinese

XIANG, CATHERINE HUA

University of Bristol; E-Mail: [Catherine.h.xiang@bris.ac.uk](mailto:Catherine.h.xiang@bris.ac.uk)

**Keywords:** apology; China; British; cross-cultural; politeness

The speech act of apologizing aims at maintaining, restoring and enhancing interpersonal relationships. This study attempted to explore the use, interpretation, and assessment of apology strategies of both native and non-native speakers of Mandarin Chinese and British English, namely both native speakers of Chinese and English as well as the language learners of these two languages. Due to limited research on Chinese apology strategies, the current study would contribute to a better understanding of realization patterns of Chinese apologies as well as deep cultural values underpin these patterns.

The data were collected via video-taped open role plays in UK and in Mainland China. Follow up evaluation questionnaires as well as group and individual interviews were carried out with the participants.

The findings revealed that similarities and differences existing in apology strategies produced by the groups. New categories of apology strategies were identified (based on the CCSARP coding manual). Differences were found mainly in the following three areas: 1. use and function of explicit and implicit apology strategies; 2. sensitivity towards face and social rights (Spencer-Oatey, 2000); 3. insider and outsider division. The study contributes to the debate of universality of politeness behaviour in the West and East and understanding of deep culture values.

## References:

Spencer-Oatey, Helen, ed. (2000). *Culturally Speaking: Managing Rapport through Talking across Cultures*. London: New York: Continuum, 2000.



## Politeness and Dyadic Relationship

ZHANG, XIAOMING

Donghua University of Shanghai, China; E-Mail: [maggiezhxm@dhhu.edu.cn](mailto:maggiezhxm@dhhu.edu.cn)

**Keywords:** strategy; pragmatic distance; politeness; dyadic relationship; linguistic communication

In the past several decades, scholars at home and abroad have attempted at an account of politeness from different perspectives. The strongest influences on the studies of politeness so far have been the two models of politeness proposed by Brown & Levinson, and by Leech. Brown & Levinson's theory is often referred to as "face-saving theory" of politeness, since their central notion is 'face' and that to be polite is to save face. Brown & Levinson describe the politeness phenomenon in terms of content (absolute ranking of impositions R) and social factors (social distance D, and relative power P). Leech put forth the famous Politeness Principles (PP) with the intention to 'rescue' Grice's Cooperative Principle (CP). Therefore, his Politeness Principle is also called conversational-maxim view of politeness and successfully explains why people so often "flout" one or more of the conversational maxims in daily communication.

Owing to the inadequacies and problems of the past models of politeness, a Chinese Professor Wang Jianhua has put forward a new theory: the Distance Principle of Politeness (DPP). The most general statement of the DPP is: pragmatic distance between the participants is the determinant of utterance politeness. That is, if the speaker uses linguistic expressions on the basis of his perception of the pragmatic distance which is accepted by the hearer as appropriate, these linguistic expressions are regarded as polite at the utterance level.

In the DPP, there are two key notions: utterance politeness and pragmatic distance. Utterance politeness is distinguished from linguistic politeness. Absolute linguistic politeness is the main subject of general pragmatics, whereas dynamic utterance politeness is of central interest in dynamic pragmatics. As a technical term, pragmatic distance refers to the degree of intimacy which is perceived and confirmed by the participants in a particular communicative event. And it is constantly changing in the course of communication. According to the DPP, whenever a verbal exchange takes place, there is a particular pragmatic distance being defined. Pragmatic distance is characterized by fluidity, and by negotiability between the speaker and the hearer.

Wang Xifeng, one of the most outstanding characters in the famous Chinese classic fiction "Hong Lou Meng" (A Dream of Red Mansions translated by Yang Xianyi and Gladys Yang), is known for her capability in dealing with different people. A lot of scholars have studied Wang Xifeng in various aspects. This paper, based on the Distance Principle of Politeness, tries to analyze the strategies that Wang Xifeng applies in communication, with the aim to show that politeness, by nature, is the strategic use of language. In the following part, it is centered on the relations between the linguistic strategies and the dyadic relationship because dyadic communication (transactions between two people) is the basic form in the process of communication. Since it is quite common that there is an overlap in the dyadic relationships, it is the relationship determined by the hearer that really matters. For the sake of discussion, we will separately discuss the strategies that Wang Xifeng employs to the following five different dyadic relationships: 1) Stranger relationship 2) Work relationship 3) Friend relationship 4) Family relationship 5) Romantic relationship. The strategies Wang Xifeng adopts are various in the different types of dyadic relationship because of the different intimacy degree of pragmatic distance. If she does not have any special intention to know the stranger better, she sends the greetings with the nature of the ritual, which show a lower intimacy degree of pragmatic distance between them. Towards the family members, she chooses the appropriate strategies to each of them according to the pragmatic distance she deduces. In the example of Xiren, with whom she shares the work relationship, Wang Xifeng adjusts her strategy in time to be polite to Xiren. The topics and the words that she chooses reveal the higher intimacy degree of pragmatic distance between Wang Xifeng and Pinger. Even after the quarrel, she apologizes for her reckless behavior to maintain the high intimate degree of the pragmatic distance. Sharing the romantic relationship with her husband—Jia Lian, Wang Xifeng applies the appropriate strategies to sustain the highest intimacy degree of the pragmatic distance.

Although such a study can never be a thorough one, we hope that it will contribute a bit in paving the way for a further study of pragmatics and that the application of the pragmatic theories into the analysis of the literary works will deepen the understanding of such great literary works as *Hong Lou Meng*.